Vol. XXVIII. OCTOBER, 1951. No. 4.

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance,* 15/-.

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Paraparauma, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Very Rev. J. H. Gleeson, St. Arnaud, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Sandgate, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Yarrawonga, Vic.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The
Australasian Catholic Record
A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction
"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,
Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 283
Apostolic Constitution *Sponsa Christi* on the sacred institute of Nuns.

PRIVATE REVELATION AND A RECENT BOOK,
Rev. Martin Toal, D.D. 294

BISHOP WILLSON, IX,
Right Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G. 313

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY .. .. Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 323
The Theology of the Mass, V.

MORAL THEOLOGY .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 340
Some Problems of Nurses—Place for hearing mass.

CANON LAW .. Right Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, D.C.L., P.P. 351
Third guarantee in mixed marriage dispensation—Sunday Mass in convent chapel—Reception into church of children baptised in heresy—Admission of ex-communist to noviceship.

LITURGY .. .. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 357
Responses and anointings in baptism of adult—Tone of voice at side-altar—Obligation to wear biretta—Restoration of the Vigil of Easter.

HOMILETICS .. .. Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 366
Blessed Oliver Plunket.

NOTES 369
Diamond Jubilee of *Rerum Novarum.*

BOOK REVIEWS 373
The Message of Fatima (Martindale); *The Irish Theological Quarterly*; *Manuale Philosophiae,* vols. I, II (Di Napoli) [p. 356]; *Hierarchy Centenary Congress,* 1850-1950 [p. 356]; *Thirty-Three Fridays* (Fr. Aloysius) [p. 372]; *Un seul Chef* (Bouessé) [p. 372].

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOLUME XXVIII 374

Nihil Obstat:

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Ia die, Octobris, 1951.

Official Documents

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
on the Sacred Institute of Nuns.

PIUS BISHOP
servant of the servants of God.
for a perpetual remembrance.

The Spouse of Christ, which is the Church, from her very earliest days, inclined her heart with a special sense of esteem and of maternal love towards Virgins, who consecrated themselves to God. She showed this esteem and love by acts and signs; and clear documentary evidence of it has come down to us from the first ages.

This is no matter for surprise, because Christian Virgins hold an illustrious place in the flock of Christ. Urged by charity, they despise all the alien cares of the world; they overcome that division of the heart, which is so easy and so perilous; they not only devote themselves entirely to Christ as the true spouse of souls, but also bind their whole life, adorned with the gems of all Christian virtues, not for a time but forever, to the service of Christ our Lord, and of His Church.

This mystical dedication of Virgins to Christ and this service of the Church was, in the early Christian centuries a matter of spontaneous devotion, showing itself more in facts than in words. When, however, in later times, Virgins formed not merely a class but a definite state and an order received by the Church, then profession of virginity began to be made publicly and was thus established set in the firmness of a close bond. Later, the Church, accepting the desire and firm purpose of virginity, inviolably consecrated the Virgin to God and the Church with a solemn ritual, which is deservedly regarded as one of the most beautiful monuments of ancient liturgy. Thus the Church clearly distinguished the consecrated Virgin from others who bound themselves to God only by private bonds.

* * * *

The profession of virginal life was maintained by ascetic practice, which was watchful and severe. It was nourished and warmed by every sort of pious and virtuous exercise. In the teaching which comes to us in the ancient writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers—in the early tradition of the east and the west—a consistent and very beautiful picture of the Christian Virgin is set before our eyes. In those writings

both the internal and external details belonging in any way to virginal sanctity and perfection are diligently and lovingly set forth and, as it were, vividly depicted by those Fathers.

To what extent the angelic mode of life followed by Christian Virgins in early times corresponded with the exhortations and descriptions of the Fathers and how much it showed itself adorned with the gems of higher and heroic virtues is partly known to us directly from trustworthy historical documents and monuments, and is partly surmised and even deducible also from other sure sources which leave no room for doubt.

When the days of peace had come for the Christians, virginity consecrated to God became more and more of the order of the day. After the pattern of the Hermits and the Cenobites, virginity was solidly united to the explicit profession of the Counsels of poverty and stricter obedience.

Women, who made profession of virginity, at an early date agreed to live a common life segregated, as far as possible, from the society of men. This naturally sprang from the love of solitude and also from the need of defence against the perils that threatened on every side in a corrupt Roman society. Then, under favouring circumstances, those virgins followed the example of the immense multitude of Cenobites, and, leaving the hermitical life for the most part to men, they imitated the cenobitic life. Thus nearly all virgins found their way into communities of cenobitic observance.

A common life, in the wider sense, the Church generally recommended to Virgins, but for a long time, she did not wish to strictly impose monastic life even on consecrated Virgins. These she left with the honours due to them even though they live free in the world. However, Virgins liturgically consecrated, living in their own homes or in a freer type of community life, became rarer and rarer, till in many places they were eliminated by law and then ceased everywhere *de facto*. More than this, there was no general movement to restore them and recently they were even prohibited.

* * * *

Things being so, the Church turned its maternal solicitude especially towards those Virgins who, choosing the better part, bade farewell to the world, and embraced all Christian perfection, and adding strict poverty and full obedience to the profession of virginity, lived in Monasteries. The cenobitic life of such Virgins the Church providently de-

fended from outside by laws of enclosure which grew in severity. From within, she so ordered their way of living as gradually to delineate the typical *Monialis* or *Sanctimonialis* entirely dedicated to a contemplative life under a rigid discipline of rule. This type is clearly sketched in the laws and religious asceticism of the Church.

When, about the advent of the Middle Age, the kind of life which consecrated Virgins led in the world, had completely ceased, *sanctimoniales,* that is, nuns increased immensely in numbers, in fervour, and in variety. They were regarded as the only successors of the ancient Virgins—their heiresses and the continuators of their lineage. Indeed, they were not only heiresses and successors, but also the faithful procuratresses of the patrimony handed down and the industrious traders, who received five talents and gained other five. Liturgical monuments, canonical documents and historical evidence of every sort — writings, sculptures, paintings — prove and vindicate this origin and dignity of Nuns, their merits and their holiness.

The state of perfection, which had been so solemnly received and so fully recognized as to acquire a public character in perfection, was represented up to the end of the middle age by Nuns alone amongst women. These, as we know from the Decretals and from the whole *Corpus iuris canonici,* formed a third category with the Monks and the Canons Regular.

Difficulties stood in the way of similar recognition being accorded to other types of institute, but they were overcome, so that Friars — Mendicants, Hospitallers, Redeemers or of whatever other name — and three centuries later Clerks Regular also were received amongst Religious and Regulars, together with Monks and Canons Regular. Nuns, however, — of all them, whether those allied to ancient Monachism or to canonical life, or those co-opted into the Second Orders of Mendicant Friars — carried on, as far as Canon Law was concerned, the unique, noble, ancient institute; they embraced the same religious way of living.

Up to the first Congregation of women, which arose in the 16th or 17th century, those only were regarded as Nuns, who in fact and in law professed a life legitimately religious. Furthermore, even after the toleration and the gradual reception of Congregations — first in fact and then by a sort of economic law — Nuns only, down to the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law, were in strict law admitted as being true Religious women and Regulars.

If, at this point, we turn our attention to the intimate facts of

monastic life, who can tell and ponder the treasures of religious perfection hidden in Monasteries? Who can name the flowers and fruits of sanctity which those enclosed gardens have brought forth for Christ and for His Church Who can tell the power of the prayers, the riches of self-oblation, the good things of all sorts with which Nuns have wholeheartedly laboured to adorn, sustain and comfort their Mother, the Church?

* * * *

The rigid and definite type of Nuns inscribed in the pages of Canon Law and of Ascetic History was easily received by the innumerable Orders, Monasteries and Convents, which always existed in the Church. It was in its main lines faithfully adopted and tenaciously retained throughout many centuries. From that general fidelity and constancy a closely-knit unity in the Institute of Nuns established itself and always resisted every sort of innovation much more strongly than the organization of all other regular or religious Institutes of both sexes. This rigid adherence to type is, within certain just limits, undoubtedly praiseworthy.

But this unity of Nuns in no way hindered the early emergence both in ascetic practice and in interior discipline of different shapes and varieties, wherewith God, wonderful in His saints, enriched and decorated His spouse the Church. These varieties of Nuns seem to arise from the variations found in the Orders and Religious Institutes of men, to which the Orders of Nuns were in some way attached. In fact, almost all Monks, Canons Regular and especially Mendicants strove to found Second Orders, which, with the retention of the general character of Nuns, differed from each other much like the First Orders amongst themselves. Likewise, some Orders of Clerks Regular and some Congregations of men founded in more recent times Orders of Nuns of their own Institute.

The varieties of Nuns just mentioned, whether we look at the history of the Institute or its general interior changes are worthy of attentive consideration. Certainly, those variations, while the general character of the contemplative life was maintained, and while the chief rules and principles of traditional discipline stood firm, gave, as it were, new force of sanctity to the old Institute.

In more recent times, especially from the end of the 16th century, new forms of Orders of Nuns were introduced, and little by little approved by the Church. See, for instance, the Institutes of St. Ursula and

of the Angelic Virgins, the Congregation of Religious of Our Lady, the Order of the Visitation, the Society of Our Lady, the Nuns of Bl. Mary of Charity, and many others. These new foundations, being from the beginning or later obliged to accept the common prevailing law of Nuns — in view of being able to profess the truly religious life then recognised for women — opened the way by the very process of adaptation for the renovation of the Law itself in different ways.

These new forms of Nuns, although they professed the contemplative canonical life, and observed strict papal enclosure adapted to their special way of life, doing so with deference to the opinions then prevalent, with difficulty, indeed, but sincerely, did not however always undertake the recital of the Divine Office. With laudible diligence they took up many works of apostolate and charity which were regarded as in keeping with their sex and their juridical state.

As the years rolled by, either the example of new Orders or the progress of Congregations and Societies which strove to combine the fruitful exercise of charity, help, education with the life of perfection, and also the general advance of events and ideas brought it about that several Monasteries of various Orders, which by their institute were following a purely contemplative life, took up in many places works of apostolate under the approbation and prudent control of the Holy See.

Hence, it gradually came about that the general Institute of nuns not only contained different Orders with their own Rules and Constitutions, but admitted a deeper division between Orders and Monasteries which followed the contemplative life only and Orders and Monasteries in which, either by a special law of constitution or by subsequent concessions of the Apostolic See, canonically approved works of apostolate were joined to the contemplative life.

In our own times, the whole Institute of Nuns, both of those Orders and Monasteries which hitherto have faithfully pursued the contemplative life, as also and especially in those which under ruling of the Church have associated in friendly union the practice of contemplation and of apostolate, in both kinds of Orders and Monasteries, the Institute of Nuns, we say, has felt in no slight way the variations and changes of circumstances and events. Really, these Orders attending as they do to works of education and charity, which either through the change of customs or through State intervention are now carried on in such a way as to be scarcely compatible or quite incompatible with some of the classical rules of papal enclosure, require a wise mitigation of the

enclosure, retaining the substance, such mitigation being such as will meet the need of the work. This, the utility of the Church and of souls seemed to demand; for without it those works either could not be undertaken at all or not undertaken in that way. It is not only in regard to apostolic Orders but also in regard to contemplative Orders that the circumstances of the times and the serious want in which they often are that seem to require mitigations or wider interpretations.

To-day, for example, the civic sense, which is called social, would scarcely tolerate too strict an interpretation of canon 601, even when there is question of contemplative Nuns. Hence, the Holy See, as a mother, daily provides in a broader way for needs or utilities which in the judgment of earlier generations were not considered so serious as to warrant the infringement of papal enclosure or exemption from it. In any case the security and inviolability of homes, which indeed was not the only cause of papal enclosure, but still contributed variously according to circumstances, together with other causes, towards its constitution and order, is to-day more than formerly insisted upon and maintained.

* * * *

After this summary presentation of the origin and history of the sacred Institute of Nuns, We now deem it opportune to distinguish accurately the proper and necessary elements which affect the contemplative canonical life of Nuns as primarily and directly connected with their end. To those native and principal lineaments whereby the canonical figure of Nuns is clearly defined in law, other important lineaments are joined, which, although not necessary, nevertheless complete the image, since they correspond to the public end of Nuns and ensure it. Other things we also find in the Institute of Nuns which are neither necessary nor completive, but are only external and historical, since they certainly came from circumstances of former times now greatly changed. If these are no longer useful, or likely to impede a greater good, they are not for any special reason to be retained.

Now, while We retain all the native and principal elements of the venerable Institute of Nuns, We have decided, with regard to other external and adventitious elements to induce with caution and prudence adaptations corresponding to present-day circumstances. These adaptations are calculated to add greater dignity and also greater efficacy to the said Institute.

What moves Us to make these temperate adaptations in the Institute of Nuns is the full knowledge which We have on the matter in all parts of the world and the cognizance We are taking of the great need in which Nuns often, not to say always, are placed. Indeed, there are not a few Monasteries, which alas! are almost perishing of hunger, misery and want of victuals; there are also many which on account of domestic difficulties carry on a hard, almost intolerable life. There are Monasteries besides, which, although they do not live in need, are nevertheless, on account of separation from any other Monasteries, in a state which is not rarely one of langour. Stricter rules of enclosure not infrequently open the way for considerable difficulties. Lastly, with the increasing needs of the Church and of souls, and with the many-sided urgency of a helping hand from everybody the moment seems to have come when monastic life generally, even among nuns given to contemplation, should be reconciled with a moderate participation in the apostolate.

This judgment of Ours has often been confirmed by the testimonies of Bishops and Religious Superiors. These testimonies have come to Us from some nations with impressive unanimity.

* * * *

From the things enacted hereafter in the General Statutes of Nuns, it will be well to illustrate some points here, so that We may set forth rules and judgments from which the single rulings may be understood rightly, easily and surely.

In the first place, with regard to the contemplative life of Nuns, that which, according to the mind of the Church always obtained, must be kept firm and inviolate, that is to say: All monasteries of Nuns must always and everywhere canonically profess the contemplative life as their first and chief end. Hence, works and ministrations, which Nuns can and should take up, ought to be such and so ordered and disposed in regard to time, place and manner, that the contemplative life truly and solidly contemplative, of the whole community and of the individual Nuns should not only be safe but always nourished and strengthened.

Rulings and concessions formerly given under the urgency of circumstances for some regions, according to which solemn vows are changed to simple are rightly described as bringing with them an odious dispensation (Can. 19) — all the more odious, since this immunity is against the chief characteristic of Nuns. Really solemn vows, which bring with them a closer and fuller consecration to God than other

public vows show forth the canonically necessary and chief note of Orders. Since, then, long experience from various places has amply shown that solemn vows of Regular men or women, although they are ignored by State laws, can be kept with the utmost ease and that likewise provision can easily be made otherwise for the security of other goods, even when juridical personality, as sometimes happens, is denied to Religious Orders and Monasteries, now for many years the laws and action of the Holy See are at one on this point, namely, that the odious exceptions mentioned above be restricted and, as far as possible be taken away. Certainly Nuns must not be deprived of the honour, merit and joy of making the solemn vows that belong to them.

In order to attain safe observance of solemn Chastity and of contemplative life and in order that the enclosed garden of the Monastery may be immune from penetration by any daring attack of the world, from violation by any wile or snare, from the disturbance of any secular and profane contagion, in order that it be a true cloister of souls, in which the Nuns can serve God with more freedom, the Church, with wise and vigilant solicitude has appointed severe enclosure as a special institute of Nuns. That enclosure the Church has diligently appointed and perpetually surrounded with grave pontifical sanctions. This venerable enclosure of Nuns, which the supreme authority whence it proceeds and from the sanctions wherewith it is defended within and without is called papal, is, in this Constitution of Ours not only (according to the different circumstances of Monasteries, which are hitherto bound by it) purposely and solemnly confirmed, but is cautiously extended even to those monasteries which hitherto are not obliged by this same enclosure, because of dispensations legitimately obtained.

Monasteries, which profess a purely contemplative life, and do not admit stable works of education, charity, recollection or any other such within the limits of the religious house, shall retain or accept that papal enclosure, of which canons 600-602 speak, and which shall be called "major" enclosure.

With regard to those Monasteries which, either by foundation or by ruling of the Holy See, join to the contemplative life the exercise of some ministrations consonant with it; within the monastic house, the papal enclosure, those things which are necessary and native to it being retained, is mitigated in some things which scarcely can be observed; in other things which for the papal enclosure of the Code are not deemed so necessary (can. 599, 604 § 2) it is fittingly compensated.

This mitigated papal enclosure, adapted to present circumstances in order to be distinguished from the ancient and more rigid enclosure, shall be called "minor" enclosure. It can be granted even to those Monasteries, which, although they have contemplative life, do not have solemn vows, or lack some conditions rightly required by jurisprudence and the accepted style of the Curia for major papal enclosure. An accurate definition of all those elements of minor papal enclosure will be given hereunder, in the General Statutes and in the Instructions to be issued by the S.C. of Religious by Our authority and in Our name.

Regarding the autonomy or mutual liberty of Monasteries of Nuns, We deem it opportune to repeat here and to apply to Nuns what We said about Monks in a Homily delivered on the 8th of September, 1947, in the Patriarchal Basilica of St. Paul outside the Walls on the occasion of the 14th centenary of the death of St. Benedict of Nursia. With the change of circumstances many things suggest and not rarely demand a federation of Monasteries of Nuns, so that the distribution of offices may be easier and better, also to facilitate the useful and often necessary transference, for a time and for various causes, of Religious from one Monastery to another, likewise economic assistance, coördination of labours, defence of common observance, and other things of the kind. That all these things may be done with derogation from necessary autonomy, without any weakening of enclosure and without any loss to recollection and the severe discipline of monastic life finds sure and certain proof in the experience of the Monastic Congregations of men and also from the fairly frequent examples of Unions and Federations which have been hitherto approved in the case of Nuns. But the erection of Federations and the approbation of Statutes regulating them shall remain reserved to the Holy See.

To work of hand or of mind all — men and women given to the contemplative life being in no way excepted — are bound not only by the law of nature, but by the duty of penance and satisfaction. Besides, work is the general instrument whereby the soul is kept from dangers and raised to higher things; whereby we give our co-operation to divine Providence, as we ought, both in the order of nature and in the supernatural order; whereby works of charity are carried out. Work is a rule and chief law of the religious life. It was so from the beginning according to the motto: *Ora et labora.* Really the discipline of the religious life always largely consisted in the obedience, order and perfection of work. The work of Nuns, in view of eternity, must be such

that she who undertakes it does so in the first place with a good intention; that she always thinks of the presence of God; that she takes it up out of obedience and joins it to voluntary self-chastisement. If work is carried out in this way, it will be a powerful and constant exercise of all virtues, and a pledge of sweet and efficacious union of the contemplative with the active life, after the example of the Holy Family of Nazareth.

If Monastic work is considered in its nature and under its disciplinary aspect it is necessary that, in keeping with the Rules, Constitutions and traditional customs of the various orders, it be proportioned to the strength of the Nuns, and that moreover it be so regulated and done that according to time and circumstances it be an earning of one's daily bread, and be useful to the poor, to society and to the Church.

Since the perfection of Christian life particularly consists in charity, and since the charity whereby we ought to love the Lord alone above everything, and all in Him, is one charity, our Mother the Church demands from all Nuns, who canonically profess contemplation, together with the perfect love of God, perfect charity towards their neighbours. By the grace of this charity and of their state religious men and religious women should feel themselves entirely dedicated to the Church and to the necessities of all who are in need.

Therefore, Nuns should all know that their vocation is fully and entirely apostolic, limited by no limits of places, things, times, but reaching out to everything always and everywhere, to everything that regards in any way the honour of their spouse and the salvation of souls. But this universal apostolic vocation of Nuns in no way hinders Monasteries from holding the needs of the whole Church and individual men, or of particular classes, as specially commended to their prayers.

The general apostolate of all Nuns, whereby they should be zealous for the honour of their Divine Spouse and should promote the good of the universal church and of all the faithful makes use of three chief instruments:—

1. The example of Christian perfection. Undoubtedly their life even without words, speaks loudly; it continually draws the faithful to Christ and to Christian perfection; it stimulates good soldiers of Christ like a banner calling to battle and draws them to the crown.

2. Prayer: This is firstly the public prayer offered in the name of the Church, solemnly offered to God seven times a day in the canonical

hours. Secondly it is the private prayer offered constantly to God in all forms.

3. Self-devotedness: This embraces all works of self-denial. It adds to the afflictions which arise from the common life and from the faithful observance of rule, other exercises of self-abnegation either presented by the Rules and Constitutions or voluntarily undertaken. These generously fill up "what is wanting to the sufferings of Christ for his body which is the Church".

Having thus set forth and accurately described the historical evolution of the Institute of Nuns, in the terms in which it can be best made to suit the needs of life in our day, We now consider the giving of general rules according to which that adaptation may be realized. The whole Constitution and the General Statutes regarding all Federations of Monasteries already made or to be made, also regarding individual Monasteries the Sacred Congregations of Religious will bring into effect. This Congregation, with Our Authority, through instructions, declarations, responses and other documents will be competent to realize all those things which belong to careful and efficacious introduction of the Constitution and to the faithful and prompt observance of the General Statutes.

(The Statutes consist of nine articles, each divided into three or more paragraphs. Its length makes it impossible for us to print a translation in our pages. No doubt, however, copies of an authentic translation will be sent to Monasteries of Nuns from Rome or from some centre of the particular Institute. The General Statutes, which belong to the papal Constitution *Sponsa Christi,* given on 21st November, 1950, are further set forth in regard to practical applications in an Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Religious (*Inter praeclara,* 23rd Nov., 1950). The latter document will be printed in the next issue of the *A.C.R.*

W. LEONARD.

Private Revelation and a Recent Book

Summary: I. An account of *The Way of Divine Love* as a revelation of a vocation to expiation.

II. "Entering into the Divine Heart,"—an analysis of this in the light of faith and reason.

III. Our Lady's intervention, and the nature of her participation in this and all *extra* activity against Evil.

IV. A reasonable analysis of the objective validity of visions and revelations: and of human acts in relation with them. Man's capacity to retell the substance of private revelations. The differences between private and public revelation.

V. The possibility of error and deception in the recording of private revelations. How we are to evaluate them; and to what belief are they entitled?

VI. Rules for discerning false visions and revelations. The natural and supernatural criteria of revelations and the church's attitude to them.

Within the last two years a book of unusual significance has appeared, dealing with the mystery and purpose of divine love and of human reparation. It is entitled *The Way of Divine Love* (Sands & Co., London, 1949 pp. 532), and is a presentation by the Superiors of the Sisters of the Society of the Sacred Heart, from accounts written, at the direction of her superiors, by a humble sister of the society, of revelations made to her during the three years of her religious life, which terminated in December, 1923, at the age of thirty-three. The book contains an autographed foreword by the then Cardinal Pacelli. The text is preceded by a valuable and illuminating analysis by Father H. Monier Vinard, S.J. It contains close on five hundred pages, rounded off by some interesting appendices, and by an unusually thorough and comprehensive index.

The book has been reviewed elsewhere, but discussion of it, in print or out of it, is not likely to end there; particularly in view of many recent, and contemporary, events which bring its subject matter before the mind. Apart from the central, underlying, theme of the mystery of divine love, and of man's reparation, and of Sister Josefa's correspondence with both, based on full accounts left by her of her revelations, there are aspects of the book which remove it far out of the ordinary. The ardour of the love here revealed is of an intensity rarely recorded, as are her own sufferings, and the nature of the trials endured by her, which appear to have actually, and in a brief span, consumed this devoted religious. The revelations claimed are of a striking nature, and proceed from apparent

deep humility. They have occasional flashes of beauty, particularly in those relating to Our Lady. Details and circumstances in some places are, perhaps, such as may make the book less acceptable to some. The latter may, as we shall see, have real, if irrelevant, grounds. The main content and general tenor of the book appear closely in harmony with the doctrine of reparation as taught in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* and included in the Office of the Sacred Heart. Here and there also throughout the book are to be found gems of Counsel, not a few applicable to those in the sacerdotal life.

The primary purpose of these revelations is contained in words attributed to Our Lord Himself: "I repeat to you again that what I have said is not new, but souls need a new impetus to make them advance, just as flame needs new fuel, if it is not to burn itself out". The Israelites had the Law and Priesthood but needed also the powerful goad of the prophets' tongue to keep them in the straight way. Indeed such revelations as come from time to time fit in with the needs of our nature, that seeks a sign, a visual restorative, a making actual of what might become for some a dry record. Even the Passion of Christ has been projected visibly out of time before us, upon the bodies of His servants, so that, "for the increase of divine love men may see . . . an effigy of the Crucified, not figured in wood or in stone, but imprinted upon living bodies by the Finger of God".[1]

The aim of the revelations to Sister Josefa Menendez is, it is claimed, "to make known My Love for men even if they do not love". This is stated explicitly in many places, particularly pages 209-12. The instrument of this call was a person already, in her own heart, dedicated to the purposes of the divine will and now called by a special vocation. It was a much-tested vocation: tested at first, and, decisively, in the conflict between the claims of natural and supernatural love, culminating in a complete acceptance of her vocation. She was to be a victim, and, it may be, a prototype of many such, through an immediate, active, sharing in the Passion of the Victimhood of Christ.

The reaction of Sister Josefa to this intimation of her special vocation is one of the most humanly confirmatory proofs in the book: "my God, if I had known, I should never have come here". How delightful common life now seemed to her in comparison with this solitary, exalted, dedication.

Indeed, the graces of her special vocation seem to have been a tor-

[1]Office of the Stigmata of St. Francis, 2nd nocturn.

ment from the beginning, countered by a mounting desire to love God and serve the divine purposes in the way asked of her: "by faith, however, she rose to the level of the graces she was receiving". (p. 24.) The revelations early speak of the coldness of souls whose vocation was to love, "who were so cold that my justice was about to overtake them. That is why I seek for love". (p. 35.) Here appears to be the key to the special dedication of Sister Josefa, an apostolate to enkindle love at all costs so that by the multiplied presence of love the divine justice may not be forced. In other words love is to make up the increasing debt to divine justice; with the increase of men, and the increase of evil, it is a deficit which the mystical body must increasingly make up, till the end. The expiating passion of Christ is renewed and, in a manner, continued in His Mystical Body, which is the church, indeed, "recalling again the words of St. Augustine, 'Christ has suffered that which He had to suffer, to the measure of *that* passion naught is wanting, the sufferings, therefore, are complete but in the *Head* only, there remains to be completed the passion of the Body' . . . our very relationship with Him demands that whatever the *Head* suffers all its *members* should suffer with it".[2]

Josefa in co-operation with her vocation seems to have been led by a steep and rapid ascent so as apparently to become, through suffering and abandonment, a total, sacrificial, victim to the divine love. In this her life followed the way of Christ and of His saints: for mystical perfecting in this life must necessarily begin with the purification, through suffering, of what was corrupted, as Christ's passion preceded his resurrection and glory. In this purgative state the soul will, it seems, bear upon it the signs of the passion, visibly or invisibly. This phase for Sister Josefa appears to have commenced with the apparition of the chalice (p. 40). This same type of visitation is recorded of St. Veronica Giuliani (1660-1727), when, at the age of thirty-three, she prepared to live entirely in Christ. Our Saviour appeared, showing her a mysterious chalice, which she recognised as the announcement of the sufferings she was now to take upon herself; the chalice symbolising the completeness of the sacrifice: as it does so fully, Our Saviour Himself having linked it, in His own words, to the complete sacrificial and redemptive effect of His Holy Passion.

From this point to the end, through the detailed accounts she has left of the three succeeding years, there followed a time of expiatory suffering, arising from and sustained by love, through-

[2] *Miserent. Redempt.* Office of the Sacred Heart.

out which there appears, under the mass of detail, the steady record of a soul re-living the phases of the Divine Passion, from the unceasing rough physical agony of the body upwards to the subtle irremediable inward pain of darkness and abandonment of the spirit.

This expiatory agony began with the pain of the Crown of Thorns. The text contains sixty-five references to this source of suffering, and for some unfathomable reason it seems for Josefa to have been the special manner of her sharing in the physical Passion. There was no external stigmatisation of this pain. The text at this point says: ". . . from that time on the Crown of Thorns became part of Josefa's life of reparation. Sometimes it signified her union with Our Lord crucified; at others, the quota of pain apportioned to her love; at others, again, the sign of long-desired forgiveness. There would be times when it never left her forehead. But no outward mark of these mysterious sufferings was visible". (p. 61.)

Ordinarily, it appears, stigmatisation commences with the presentation of the Crown of Thorns in circumstances always more or less similar. St. Veronica Giulani has left an account of this occurrence as it came to her. Of the pain that accompanied its reception, she said, "At that instant I felt pain such as I had never known, or heard of any so atrocious", and, at times, as when she had occasion to lift her head, she felt as if she would expire. To her, this state endured for the remaining thirty-five years of her life. In those days the poor sufferer was subjected to a rigorous examination and seclusion, and doctors and surgeons were sent to examine and, if possible, heal her. There is a certain painful amusement in the record of their endeavours. They anointed her head, upon which she bore a raised reddish circle with certain piercings and protuberances, with some kind of oil. This had for effect to intensify her pain to burning agony while, within, her brain felt like ice. Her sufferings distressed those who were trying to relieve her; *she,* however, comforted *them.* They then proceeded to apply heated irons to her head, and to one leg, and, as these failed to heal her, other refinements of their art. Having done their utmost in vain they withdrew, confessing themselves defeated by a condition which they concluded could only be supernatural.

II.

The Way of Divine Love may be considered as a textbook on the Love of the Sacred Heart, the devotion which has gradually come to be the principal expression of the mystery of reparation and

expiation[3] within the Mystical Body. It is now part of the church's *lex orandi.* What is of special note, in reference to this book, is the repeated mention of Josefa's entering into the Sacred Heart. Indeed these narratives, despite their chronicle of suffering, seem also to be an account of exceeding mystical joy and divine consolation, spoken of as received *literally* within this Sacred Heart. The references speak of what appears as actual physical entry into the Divine Heart, and of complete and perfect happiness reposing there. Towards the entry to this Heart, she tells us, her love moved her. To this was added a corresponding attraction that drew her into the divine heart. ". . . His heart was flooded with effulgent light, the Wound wide open, and from It issued a force that drew me into it!" There are eighteen such references.

What is to be understood of claims of this kind? Is this an aspect of mystical things that is purely figurative, or does it correspond to actual states of the soul in certain circumstances? Has it a foundation in reason or does it correspond with revealed and defined truth, as it relates to the Person and the Passion of Christ? It seems, that, however strange the terms and figures used here, their usage has a foundation in the natural and divine order. We are reminded of the commentary of St. Gregory on the entering in to the room, of the risen Christ, "The doors being close" . . . ut rebus mirabilibus fidem praebeant facta mirabiliora".

To explain, we may here recall certain corollaries of the great central mystery of the Incarnation. To do this we have to cast our minds back to that great period in the life of the church, from the fourth to the seventh century, when the revealed aspects of this supreme mystery were not so much unfolded, or developed as, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, set forth in clear outline, the church, but emerged from the catacombs and the long agony of the persecutions, now moving wondrously and serenely through the labyrinth of error that human perversity laid open to her, until she had secured, in true and unalterable form for all time, that which had been known and believed from the beginning.

As a result of this it is of faith that in adoring Christ we may not differentiate between the honour we give to the human nature of Christ and that we give the divine, but must hold as the object of our adoration the union of both in the Person of the Incarnate Word.[4] In Jesus, there

---

[3] *Miser. Redemptor.* Office of the S. Heart.
[4] V th Gen. Council (Constant. II). *Denzinger,* 221.

are two nature, and since each is a principle of operation or activity, there are two wills and two operations. Again, there is no human activity of Christ in which the Divinity did not share, while the Humanity shared in all those divine operations for which Christ became Incarnate, that is, those relating to man's redemption. The Fathers to express this unity and harmony of operation in Christ described is as theandric.

Now, two wills mean two loves; the Uncreated, common to the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, and the created, that began when the Word was made Flesh. In the Person of Jesus Christ both loves are manifested in Him by one act (*ordine*). And of this theandric act of love the Heart within the Body of Christ is the instrument and organ: for the heart is undoubtedly the organ of the body's nobler emotions. Here, then, love *is centred* and *symbolised in the Word Incarnate.* We may reverently conceive that in the hours of the *A*gony, when the Son of Man was to fulfil that for which a Body was given unto Him (*Hostiam et oblationem noluisti, corpus autem aptasti mihi, holocautomata pro peccato non tibi placuerunt*: *tunc dixi*: *Ecce, venio*)[5] Christ became entirely Victim and Expiatory. His intellect perceiving the immensity of evil laid upon Him in the physical act of that perception was strained past all normal reaction, anguished unto a sweat of blood, (*a yet inadequate token of the inner suffering*): the will enduring the frustration of the object of its love, the physical instrument of it, the Heart of Flesh, had to sustain, to carry, the dual load of this infinite pain.

Setting aside the theology of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, we come here to a possible understanding of this mystical experience spoken of by Sister Josefa; regarding entering into the Divine Heart. To the question, how does the Wound in the Heart sensibly express the operation of love, St. Thomas gives answer, more or less in the following terms. In general, a thing understood resides in the intellect otherwise than the thing loved is in the one loving: the will and the intellect attain their objects differently. The likeness of the thing known, which is in the mind knowing is not the actual physical likeness of the thing, but what the logicians call an *intentional* likeness, one which corresponds to the nature and powers of the mind; (so, an idea of a tree is not a sort of photograph of a tree but an intellectual

[5]Sacrifice and oblation Thou would'st not: but a body Thou hast fitted to me: holocausts for sin did not please Thee. Then said I: behold I come". Ps. 39: Hebr. 10, 5.

abstract of what goes to make up a tree). But that which is loved is either *possessed,* or, is being *drawn into* the possession of the one loving. So the end of loving is not to possess a *likeness* of the thing, as in the act of knowing, but to *possess the loved object itself;* and the one loving, as it were, *wounds itself,* so that it may make way for the entrance *into itself* of that which it loves.[6]

It would be of interest to know how this comparatively untaught lay-sister could have arrived at this mystical instruction other than by the way she claimed. The depth of peace, of love, of happiness and of rest, she claims to have found there is fully in accord with the church's phrases describing this Heart as the Abode wherein are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. There is even more authority for this claim than St. Thomas. In the Roman Breviary, in the second nocturn of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, it is stated that "frequently, in the course of centuries, the Fathers, Doctors, and Saints celebrate the love of Our Saviour; and claim that the wound opened in the Side of Christ is the mysterious fountain of all graces . . . and through this wound contemplative souls are wont, as it were, to enter into the Heart of the Saviour".

III.

Throughout the narrative of these revelations visions of Our Blessed Lady are constantly mentioned; nearly sixty are recorded. Their description is edifying and impressive. They principally took place for a particular purpose, namely, to prepare for and, subsequently, to confirm the authenticity of the appearances or visions received from Our Lord, as against possible and, actually recorded, diabolical deceptions. Our Lady first appears in answer to Sister Josefa's intense and urgent prayer that she be saved from delusion in these mysterious happenings. There were also visits of consolation after some particularly severe or terrifying trial. There is a parallel to this also in the life of St. Veronica Giulani, who records similar comforting visitations, in like circumstances.

This special exaltation of Our Lady, in that to her it should be given to verify, in view of diabolic simulation, the truth of Our Saviour's apparitions, raises the reflection which, since it also happened to one whom the church has raised to the honours of the altar we may law-

[6]"Ex hoc quod amor transformat amantem in amatum, facit amantem intrare ad interiora amati, et e contra....et ideo amans quodammodo penetrat in amatum, et similiter amatum penetrat amantem ad interiora ejus perveniens, et propter hoc dicitur quod amor vulnerat et transfigit jecur". III D. 27, q. I, a. 1, ad. 4.

fully here consider. How is it that if the devil were permitted to impersonate, to Sister Josefa, the Person of Our Saviour, that the spirits of evil did not dare to attempt the same in regard to Christ's Holy Mother?

Subject to higher authority, it would seem that the answer is as follows: In these manifestations He of Whom there is question is the Christ of the Passion, the Victim *delivered over* to the prey of Evil, to expiate in His Own Person the iniquities of us all. Now these revelations, and indeed the whole devotion to the Sacred Heart, is an exercise in contemplation of Our Saviour during the hours of His Passion. By His Own Will he submitted Himself to the forces of violence and deceit, *"oblatus est quia ipse voluit"*, and again, *"tradidit seipsum* pro nobis *oblationem et hostiam Deo"*.

By the preventing grace of this same Passion, encompassing her from the first instant of her existence, Our Lady was *preserved* from this dominion. *He* was the Victim. *Her* destiny, on the contrary, was, and from the beginning, set in *active* and *unremitting enmity and combat* with the Evil One, who was yet to torment, to bruise, Her Son, as He expiated the divine justice. *"Inimicitias ponam te inter et Mulierem"*.[7] In Mary the sign and seal of this enmity is her Immaculate Conception, by which also She is enabled to be raised up, without fear of fall, above all creatures in glory. In the light of this reflection it does not seem without basis to say that, since Calvary, every *special* activity raised up within the church to confront evil, outside that contained within the direct mission, and all means pertaining to its attainment, of the church, may safely be attributed to Mary. In holy wisdom and in due time they come forth, not from the direct decree of Providence, as manifested in the structure of the church, but bestowed for the special comfort and protection of her children, like the wine of Cana, at the confident intercession of the Mother of Jesus. As Supreme Dispensatrix of the merits of her Son's Redeeming Passion, these "new impulses", new and ever rising forms of combat against evil, may well be attributed to this divinely-set and unremitting enmity between the Woman and the serpent's seed.

As to the book under consideration, one is inclined to the notion that it is the pervading influence of Mary throughout these pages that

---

7"I will establish a feud between thee and the Woman: between thy offspring and hers". Gen. III. 15. This text now forms the Offertory in the new Mass of the Assumption.

gives them their deepest claim to our reverential consideration. Indeed, in this regard it has received in our own days an oblique confirmation from two sources. One, Our Lady's apparitions at Fatima confirm Sister Josefa's anxious urging of the need of prayer and penance to avert the divine justice. The other is the Definition of the Assumption of Mary into heaven. To the present writer, the most striking and beautiful, and also comprehensive, recording in this book is that in which Our Lady is said to speak of the true beginning, for her, of joy at the moment of her Assumption. There is a moving beauty, a range and delicacy of comprehension, in this account (p. 408) that is indeed impressive.

IV

The most detailed and consecutive of the accounts of revelations recorded are those concerned with what the book describes as "the secrets of the passion". There is nothing whatever new in this record, as the text points out, adding, however, that in them "Jesus meant to disclose *to Josefa* [italics writer's] the secrets of the Heart's depths, spoken to one who would understand and sympathise with his inmost sufferings". This latter is the compiler's assertion. The substance, however, of these revelations are such as could easily be the pious, loving reflections of a simple soul, meditating upon the Passion of Our Saviour, coloured and intermingled with much that she could have heard and noted during retreats and during her ordinary devotional exercises. They cannot, therefore, as far as their verbal contents go, be called revelations at all. If this is asserted of these particular revelations here we may ask what is to be thought of all the revelations, as revelations, particularly in view of the apparent sanctity of the person by whom they were recorded, and, indeed, of all such private revelations? To what extent are they revelations, or, more accurately, a *true record of revelations?* And if they are such, to what degree of assent are they entitled?

An answer involves many considerations, such as the physical nature of such occurrences, considered in relation to individual men in their earthly life; man's way of knowing; his natural fallibility; all in confrontation with the claim to record the divine, the infallible.

In general, it may be said that every vision or revelation that does actually rest upon a true foundation, and which is also a consequence of a perfectly ordered life, has for basis something real and objective. This is true in the order of grace as of nature. Where any such happening

of grace has taken place by this the *whole* being of the person so favoured has been raised to a higher degree of perceptive power, so that the circle, the range, of the faculties being enlarged, there now come within their compass objects and truths and events hitherto unperceived. In this elevation of powers there happens to the whole being that which happens to the faculties of the soul through the virtues of faith, hope, and charity... Let us consider this in more detail.

The senses, both external and internal, partake of this enlargement, so that, as we read, in this state sin is physically discerned, a consecrated Host distinguished from an ordinary one. More, the senses now, as the soul hitherto, seem at times endowed with the capability of transcending the material limits of time and space, and of receiving the impact of events and persons and things previously unknown, and unknowable, by that person.

Those new perceptions are not purely subjective. They rest on objective reality. The Risen Lord was touched in the Flesh and partook of earthly food. These objects affect the sensibilities as can objects in the ordinary state of sensation. But by reason of this greatly increased and intensified sensibility, objects perceived in this state, it may reasonably be inferred, would impact themselves upon the person seeing them ever more deeply. Souls, filled with love for Our Saviour and actually thus enabled, and so disposed, to contemplate and to share in His Passion, especially women, with their natural deeper emotional capacity and their natural greater generosity of love and sympathy, might well have the most piercing moments of that Agony impressed upon their own sensibilities, as a special mark of divine favour.

This elevation of the being may, it appears, extend itself to the powers of locomotion which can acquire a like transcendence as to the limitations of time and space, and their operations in this respect must also possess a true objectivity. If this happens in the lesser powers of the person there is no reason why it does not take place in the higher. So, therefore, there must be a true reality, an objective basis, for the visions perceived in the supernaturally elevated higher faculties of the soul.

But while this is true, we may not then immediately believe and admit without examination whatever such a person may see or believes to see in such a state. For here two diverse elements concur, one divine, one human. The divine contribution is infallible, and that which it may communicate is divinely true. But it is apprehended by

a human faculty that is not yet perfected or in contemplation of the Supreme Truth, and not yet, therefore, at rest. At this point the possibility of error begins.

Error is an unending possibility in all human knowledge. Here we speak of knowledge resulting from contact between immutable truth and a mind that can, and does, yield to diverse influences, and, so, to deceit in sense and intellect. The soul receiving a vision is not merely a fixed, passive, *tabula rasa* upon which the revelation is stamped ineffaceably, but a nature, endowed with its own particular light and power of acting and receiving. *Natural* faculties are normally under regular control, their power and mode of apprehension known; and used and regulated accordingly. But raised out of themselves into another spiritual climate, extended far beyond their normal perception, the intelligence will, later, be at a loss to express itself. Returned from the state of ecstasy to that of ordinary existence, the soul thus favoured must seek itself to grasp what it has seen, and then transmit an account to others. Here it may claim no infallibility. Ordered, as in Sister Josefa's case as in most other similar cases, by their superiors to make an account of these things, they must seek to do so, and no doubt with fervent obedience, to recall and express them in human words and pictures, with which alone the mind is equipped and practised; and which convey to all alike but similar notions and pictures. Accordingly, since the visionary must strive to describe in ordinary language that which transcends human experience, its formal account will come to us in words and phrases that convey nothing new and little or nothing of that which ordinarily "it is not given to man to see". The ecstatic has had a vision, but for us there is no corresponding revelation of that vision.

The visionary then, as we have said, must strive to recall, with faculties brought down to their ordinary restricted range, that which they perceived when these same faculties were, as it were, transfigured and elevated to a wondrous degree of perception. Hence the significance of phrases that occur so frequently in Sister Josefa's narrations, such as, "I am not able to explain what happens. . . . I saw in a way impossible to explain. . . . I cannot very well describe" (pp. 25, 26, passim). In the record of such revelations we cannot expect complete accuracy or objective validity.[8] For it was the divine power made visible in the soul

[8]In the sense that the visionary's words correspond actually to the substance of the vision.

the objects of this raised contemplation, which, being withdrawn, it is the unaided natural powers that now are left to convey that which the ecstatic could perceive only by special divine intervention. Such accounts, of themselves, will, therefore, have little enduring value, except where some special gift is manifest, as that of teaching in mystical matters, of guiding souls, and then only when joined to unusual natural powers. We cannot, therefore, on this ground, compare that which the humble but heroically loving soul of the simple lay-sister narrates with the exquisitely delicate perceptions, the human grace, the natural elegance and unconscious power of the great lady of Avila.

Human language and human vision, through which alone man can tell of divine illumination, is, in relation to divine truth only but a dim and tenuous medium that can take in this light; when broken down and refracted in countless ways; the mind seeing as, in Aristotle's phrase, the bat sees: only in the diminished light of evening. The intellect having to describe the now departed splendour cannot but cast upon it its own shadows and limitations. Only when the hand of God conspires to guide the pen is something of this perfect light brought to the eyes of men, here, too, varying to the theme in power and intensity; the day to day narrative journeying and teaching soaring to convey that which of itself is by us incomprehensible and inexpressible, the ecstatic praise and exultation of the mother of the Newly-Incarnate, the eagle vision of the Word co-Eternal in the Bosom of the Father.[9] These things are brought down to our seeing, in a few lines written by a man's hand, only by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Relative to Revealed Truth we may here state that this belongs to an order of things totally different. It is in and through the substance of the formally revealed Deposit alone that private revelation must seek its confirmation and guarantee. In the communication of this truth from the Godhead to man there is no human or fallible intermediary. The Divine Power was One with Him who communicated God's word here on earth, "The Father and I are One". And the preservation of It, in its integrity, to men, is entrusted to the Divine Paraclete. It is, therefore, and remains, the work of the Blessed Trinity, in whose Name it is taught. And for the reception into each soul, by assent, of the proposed substance of faith the natural power of the intellect is supernaturally raised up by the power, or virtue, of faith, divinely bestowed. At no point, therefore, in its progress from God to each single

[9]Luke I, 46; John I, 1.

soul is the integrity of the truth of Divine and Catholic faith contingent on the faltering mind of man.

V

Establishing thus the distinction and the differences between private and public revelation we can consider more clearly the value of the former. Both are from God. The mystical vision is a great perfecting of the natural vision of the individual. The acts, however, continue to be those of that individual: *acta sunt suppositorum* is true as long as the person lives. The range of its vision, again, is extended not alone as regards God, but as regards other things and persons external to itself and also as regards knowledge of itself. Accordingly, the soul's own life becomes more clearly known, and the bonds of its relationship to other souls, within the Mystical Body. Hence a characteristic of such souls is a deeper love and understanding of the church, and of its mission and authority, and especially of that portion of it of which they are themselves organically a part, as fulfilling a similar function. These characteristics are always manifest in the life of the saints and are markedly so in this record of Sister Josefa's life.

Pursuing, however, the point of our inquiry as to the value of these records as revelations we learn that in the *very highest form* of these special divine favours it would seem as if the natural powers are all but extinguished in the light of the supernatural. Descending from this height the soul, as we noted, must endeavour to convey the divine language of its vision in human terms, and this when the divine light by which it contemplated this vision is withdrawn. Memory must here carry the burden, and though one cannot recall in the night's recollection the full splendour of the noon-day sun, something of it may yet be recaptured, dependent upon the skill and visual memory of the recorder. But even allowing for this simile, divine contemplations belong to the divine life, and for this there is no corresponding expression in this other life of creatures. On this account the ecstatic has to fall back on the language of symbolism in regard to acts and feelings and modes of speech.[10] These, essentially of the earth, will bear upon them their special imprint of race, of period, of idiom, which, inevitably, will influence their degree of acceptance: unless where by special knowledge or discernment their inward meaning becomes clear. These are the records, not of divine actions, but of a soul *in via.*

Entering into this exalted sphere the soul is brought more clearly

[10]A language actually of analogy (i.e., analogy of true proportionality).

to view, not alone itself and the regions of light, but also the regions of darkness. Angels and demons differ as other creatures differ, one from another, but in essence and power they are the same. The soul entering this higher region of creation is the object of attraction from both sides, and while such a soul is, by grace and desire, drawn to the one side, yet remaining human, it is still exposed to the attraction of the other. These temptations may prepare the way for illusions, and no one can say to what degree God permits these, *to prove, to punish, or to perfect a soul.* The illusions are the work of angelic powers, and there is no immediate criterion whereby the mind can readily discern the illusive from the true vision. The true vision will convince the seer the false may not create immediate belief, or unbelief, but it will, as its aim is, create unrest and doubt regarding all such things.

Lastly, this upward flight of the soul places greater strain upon the human powers. At that altitude, as it were, the least flaw can bring the soul to disaster. Faith, hope, and charity, its great wings, are tested to the utmost. More perilous here the contest than upon the comparatively inarduous plane of ordinary human struggle. The latter part of this book is filled with the atmosphere of this apprehension caused through fear of diabolic delusion, and the perils it opened to her soul. It is possibly only in this light that one can apprehend the agony and trepidation of this soul, and of such souls, to our seeing, so purified by suffering and love, until the contest had ended and the small dove of her vision, cleansed of its last faint shadow, winged upwards in unimpeded flight.

* * * *

No matter how we view them, we can find in no extra-apostolic writings any ultimate or intrinsic guarantee to authorise them, so as to admit them as incontestable truth or use them as apologetic. This for the security of the faith. The fruits of heavenly knowledge, like those of earth, are garnered with trepidation and care, by the contest of truth against error, of light with darkness. Their selection and approval proceeds along lines indicated by the highest and most experienced prudence, allowing for that discernment in the things of the spirit, diffused here and there by divine favour within the church.

What in general are the guides to that which is true and authentic in such visions and revelations? How are we to view such happenings? What is to be considered of the great quantity of revelations contained in this book; and coming from a person, the evi-

dence of whose life, so far as here presented, is one of heroic suffering and love? These and similar contemporary records are widely read. Allowing for the possibility of illusion, to which they may be subjected, does this affect their true worth and inner authenticity; or their value as an incitement to virtue; or take from the value of the record of this soul's suffering in reparation; and of her love for Christ and His Blessed Mother? Finally, how may we evaluate all and any such claims and occurrences? The great masters in this science leave no margin for error or doubt with regard to this question,[11] though their standard at first may seem rigorous beyond measure.

For them that a vision, or a vision claimed, be followed by repose of spirit, by peace, by recollection of spirit, by pious inspirations, by a tender love of God, by a clearer perception of the mysteries of faith: or because the vision increases zeal for the glory of God and spiritual things, even should it be accompanied by seeming miracles, those, namely, that do not pass beyond angelic powers: despite all this, it is not allowable, on these grounds, to conclude that the vision comes from God. The sanctity of the environment where they are said to occur, the surprising newness of what may be seen there, the testimony of the person so favoured, his good disposition and evident and known piety, are not yet signs which sufficiently exclude doubt. For the great minds in these matters point out that, notwithstanding the presence of all these indications, illusion is still possible, because, however holy the person, while on this earth, he is still subject to error and deception, and this, in such a case, may come either from the natural powers stimulated by some physical cause, or by the devil working upon the person either from without or from within.

As a general rule, such favours are suspect in persons obviously unworthy of them: who have not merited them: who desire them, or are excited or stirred up to seek them: who, as will happen, come to believe that they are worthy of them or such as may receive them: whose spiritual antecedents are unknown, or unusual, or not formed by God's words, or the teaching of the Church. Such also as seek them from curiosity, or vanity, or to appear holy or mysterious. Suspect, too, are visions claimed by persons given to practices and mortifications that are extreme, and too easily discerned; who have a pronounced attach-

[11]Some among the chief (and standard) guides in this are Gerson (+ 1429), Bona (+ 1674); the famous Flemish mystic and master in the spiritual life, BI John Ruysbroek (+ 1381); as also the great St. Teresa (especially the Autobiography) and St. John of the Cross.

ment to their own will, and, especially, a readiness to disclose without reserve that which they claim to have seen.

The same doubt is warranted of visions and revelations received by persons who have barely commenced upon the way of spiritual perfection, or who make these claims without having first trodden the way of suffering and purification and, of a sudden, claim to have come to the spiritual heights. St. Therese, young as she was, reached there only after such physical and mental suffering, and suffering of the soul, as would dismay the heart to dwell upon. Her "little way" is the way of intrepid spiritual heroism. Doubtful, also, are such as have no obvious grasp or even perception of humility, and who, seemingly, are unaware that the way to such divine favours is not other than that of the cross, of suffering, of persecution, and of self-conquest.

As illusory, also, must be regarded communications concerning purely philosophical questions or things otherwise known, or knowable; or things hitherto unknown, and now proposed in a strange manner: or quasi-meaningless things, or new purposeless ways of living or acting, and especially things unknown or opposed to sacred scripture. Doubtful, likewise, according to these authorities, are revelations accompanied by violence, or disorder, or confusion of movement or of speech: or coming from persons of vivid or disordered imagination: or whose senses are notably acute, or notably defective. Indisputably unworthy are all such communications which arise in circumstances either of place or of person, which are vain or shameful, relate to superstition or religious error (e.g., speaking of the church and "the churches" with a common supposition): where greed or sensuality are implicated: where salvation is represented as an easy thing, or practices inculcated which give ground for this credulity, or which aim mainly to satisfy curiosity, without any desire or urging to amending one's life. Where such bring *forth no more than ordinary fruit of good living* in the receiver they are false; or if they lack dignity, or calm and peace, as become the things that betoken God's action,[12] and, on the contrary, create disturbance, impatience, or disorder. All such are false, and come either from the devil, or from man's own vanity, and are destructive of peace and virtue, and may lead to doubt, diffidence, and even to despair in such as believe them, or have been influenced by them.

[12]The divine action is incompatible with violence—"disposing all things sweetly" (Prov.). Conscience however under divine grace may be violently disturbed in combating and overcoming temptation. But the resisting the action, here the cause of conflict, is not divine.

If the signs of truth in visions and revelations are not infallible, how then may we distinguish the false from those which do come from God? The answer is that there remains the guarantee of truth this, namely, that the true vision, of itself, generates assent to it by its own irresistible force. What is it that enables us to discern the unreality of objects of dreams from the realities of waking impressions, even when the impressions made by day are such as the seeming real objects evoked in sleep? It is the instinctive, the natural, capacity of the mind to know truth, to know things that exist outside of self.

Whatever moves into the sphere of our awareness has the native power to impact itself upon us, and, by the road of our senses, fertilise with a kind of seminal form of itself the passive intellect which, so fertilised and by its natural action, brings forth a mental image of the object. By this image the mind is led out to awareness of the object thus brought before it. So our intellect works, so our concepts arise, independent of our deliberate act; for the intellect was made to this end: to know. By this native activity we immediately perceive *things,* and even those basic *principles* which are self-evident and upon which the subsequent structure of our knowledge is reared. This is the beginning of all knowledge, of all certitude, the point of commencement of all inquiry, the cornerstone, actually, of the *philosophia perennis;* the starting point of "the great tradition" in the theory of human knowledge. The starting point on the way to our true end, which is: *to know God.*

This is true also of the supernatural knowing that the soul may receive directly from God. It is accompanied by a light, an infused light, that elevates and perfects the natural light, so as to enable it to perceive the intrinsic truth of the things which God has deigned to manifest to His servant, so that the soul cannot be left in doubt of that which it sees. It is as the light of faith that comes to the soul that has reached the use of reason, and by means of which doubt is scattered and man is enabled to see clearly what hitherto was uncertain, or but dimly or uncertainly perceived. In actual visions, we learn, that this supernaturally aided instinct is, in the recipient, accompanied by the gift of the discernment of spirits, which leaves no room for doubt, because this gift not alone illumines the mind but also solicits the assent of the will.

But this is a *personal, particular,* (and, in a sense, a purely subjective,) gift. To bring the conviction it produces into *other* minds this assent has to be gained by the witness of the *fruits* of such divine favours

in the *first* recipient. Being divine and supernatural this communication, its effect must reveal a like nature. Such, for example, would be a perfect conversion, complete and enduring (as recorded, say, of St. Augustine or St. Ignatius), without any trace of evil: a perfection of life such as human creatures ordinarily are incapable of: a power for good in this person as could come from God alone: an activity in the recipient arising from grace that penetrates and embraces all his subsequent life: a direction of that life that is fully submissive to the divine will and to the divine economy of providence, especially as shown forth in the teaching and authority of the church. In such cases it would be wrong to doubt the truth of evidences which bear such pronounced reasons for certitude.

Here then briefly we have considered some of the grounds for the supernatural prudence of the church in these matters. But while exercising this supreme caution, she is aware that the Holy Spirit, promised to Her by Her Founder for guidance in teaching the things He confided to Her to teach, yet She is aware that the Holy Spirit works not alone in the Holy Church, but also in its single members. The church, therefore, is far from setting aside, or contemning, the treasures of sacred knowledge, of holy wisdom, and spiritual contemplation, that have been nourished in Her own very bosom and that have come to fruition through Her teaching and Her Sacramental Food.

Indeed, she reverences and receives with gratitude these true fruits of the Holy Spirit, regarding them as a means to know better the divine deposit already bestowed, but without conceding to them any sovereign or absolute authority. They are not, and may not be, employed in proof of her truth. Rather, her truth is used to showing their worthiness, so that, of themselves, they are never the basis for new doctrines or new practices. Accordingly, they can never be accepted by her, or employed in her *lex orandi,* without incontrovertible proofs of their divine origin, such, namely, as can stand confrontation with her own defined beliefs.

The examination of such happenings need not necessarily be immediate, but when it takes place it will be searching, reaching down to the utmost intimate foundations in the life of the ecstatic and the details of visions and communications attributed to them. The church's judgment will be favourable when such happenings have come to exercise a patently supernatural and divine influence on the person of the ecstatic and on the persons and circumstances of his environment, and without

any longer a danger of illusion. When, too, there have been followed unmistakable signs, such as miracles, healings, and such like. When signs are obviously wanting, wholly or in part, even though the visions or revelations contain nothing that could be reproved, the church abstains from remark.

While, therefore, the person to whom these visions were truly communicated is obliged, as we have seen, to believe them, the church does not require from others such assent as her own truths demand, but contents herself with recommending them as worthy of reverence, and even of belief, and as aids to salvation. Sometimes she may include them in her public prayers, as in the Divine Office of the Feast of the Sacred Heart. But ordinarily she leaves to each one to determine to what degree he may give assent to them, which will be according to the measure of each one's personal conviction. But she forbids the rejection unconditionally of such as have obtained her toleration and countenance.

Concluding, then, these reflections which the subject matter of this book, as well as certain contemporary happenings, have evoked, we feel secure in assenting to the words, attributed to Our Lord, spoken to Sister Josefa shortly before her death: "My words will be light and life for an incalculable number of souls, and I will grant them a special grace of conversion and illumination". This fulfilment will provide such fruits as to prove incontestably the authenticity of Sister Josefa's revelations. And here we may respectfully repeat the words of the then Cardinal Pacelli, which he wrote as a foreward to the publication of the book, in 1938: "I have no doubt whatever that the publication of these pages, filled as they are with the great love which His grace inspired in His very humble servant, Maria Josefa Menendez, will be agreeable to His Sacred Heart". In the years since these words were written the devotion that has been awakend by these writings bear out the wisdom and devotion of the Holy Father. And we may also end by repeating, with proper respect and reverence, His Holiness's prayer, ".... that they may efficaciously contribute to develop in many souls a confidence ever more complete and loving in the infinite mercy of this Divine Heart towards poor sinners such as we all are".

M. F. TOAL.

Bishop Willson, IX.

THE DISPUTE BETWEEN DR. WILLSON AND FATHER THERRY.

(1st Phase: 1840-1844, Part I)

Summary: Father Therry's financial position—He tells Dr. Polding that St. Joseph's Church is free of debt—Dr. Willson's two conditions: (1) Hobart Church to be handed over free of debt; (2) Father Therry to leave Tasmania—Dr. Polding assures him on these points—Alarming news of debt from Therry—Cold reception of Willson at Hobart—Alarmed at large debt—He invites Therry to give statement—Therry refuses to surrender papers—Dispute about auditors—Therry appeals to Lieutenant-Governor—Polding writes to Willson—Describes character of Therry—Polding and Willson go to Hobart—Willson objects to Polding's actions—A partial agreement reached between the parties—Renewed protest by Therry.

Not always do missionary ardour and business ability work in harmony. We see this verified in Father Therry: muddle and mismanagement characterised several enterprises undertaken from the highest motives. Seldom did he display the wisdom of the children of this world in his planning; neither did he invariably act prudently in the choice of advisers. He built for the distant future, regardless of existing conditions. Before he had been two years in Hobart his expenditure for religious purposes reached a figure far in excess of his receipts. Private debts, too, quickly accumulated. In at least one instance the generous pastor, unable to see the dangers ahead, borrowed from the same source—his friend and fellow countryman, John Regan—for private as well as for ecclesiastical needs. When the day of reckoning came it proved an impossible task to fix the boundary between personal and public obligations.

In November, 1840, Father Therry received a letter from Dr. Polding. The Bishop referred to a rumour circulating in Sydney that his Vicar-General for Tasmania had expressed a desire to abandon the mission. The reply, which followed Bishop Polding to London, gave a denial to the report, at the same time mentioning the existence of financial problems yet to be solved.

"Were such an intention seriously entertained by me", wrote the priest, "it should never be acted upon without Your Lordship's full and formal approbation. But it would be worse than folly on my part, however inclined I might be to form at present such a resolution, involved, as I am, in difficulties arising from heavy personal responsibili-

ties on account of our intended churches, and from which I could not for a considerable time be freed without a ruinous sacrifice of personal property which might render me unable to fulfil obligations of justice and charity to which I am bound".

A later mail from Australia brought tidings giving further evidence of Father Therry's increasing worries. On 25th May, 1841, he wrote:

"It will give Your Lordship great pain to learn that Sir John Franklin, the Lieutenant-Governor, has availed himself of power . . . to refuse assistance to St. Joseph's Church. On account of that Church alone I am now personally responsible for Fifteen Hundred Pounds".

Did conditions improve? Or did the optimistic Father Therry regard money imagined to be in sight as money already in hand? Whatever be the explanation of his good fortune, he notified Dr. Polding in 1842 that St. Joseph's Church was "unencumbered by debt". Later still that same year, in answer to renewed appeals and pressure, Sir John Franklin advanced £1500 towards the cost of St. Joseph's Church anticipating imperial approval. News of this belated act of justice did not reach England until after Archbishop Polding's departure for Sydney. Hence it had no bearing on the statement that all debts had been liquidated.

On the creation of the diocese of Hobart Town by the severance of Tasmania from Dr. Polding's territory, the Most Rev. R. W. Willson was elected to the new See. Before giving consent to be consecrated he insisted on two points. In the first place he would not begin his episcopal career by accepting a burden of debt. The other stipulation was that Father Therry should be recalled to Sydney. Without hesitation, Archbishop Polding gave an assurance "on Mr. Therry's word and in writing that the Church in Hobart Town was unencumbered by debt". He also informed Lord Stanley, Secretary of State, that he desired the newly appointed Bishop to receive the salary hitherto granted to Father Therry as Head of the Church in Tasmania. The late Vicar-General would retire from his official position in the Colony.

Having reached Sydney, the Archbishop wrote to Hobart verifying the information, already widely published, that a Bishop had been chosen and consecrated. Father Therry received instructions to have all papers and documents in readiness to surrender to Dr. Willson. What was the financial position at this time? The answer is supplied in an advertisement published in the press on 3rd March, 1843:

"The Rev. J. J. Therry regrets to have to inform the friends of Religion and Education that the sum of £1000 will be required to enable him, with the other trustees, to complete St. Joseph's Church and the large schoolroom and

clergyman's house thereto attached, and to transfer them free of all debt to the Catholic Bishop, whose arrival may be shortly expected".

Fourteen months after this date, when Dr. Willson landed in Hobart, the debt, it was claimed, amounted to more than £3000. Had the priest heard of the assurance given to the Bishop? Had he received any admonition to suspend operations? It would seem not. Archbishop Polding certainly knew that the pledge given in England in 1842 could not be renewed in 1843. This is evident from a note written to Father Therry on 4th May of this latter year:

"From the papers which some kind friend is so good as to send me I perceive that your exertions on behalf of St. Joseph's Church continue unabated. I fear, however, the general depression prevents the obtaining of funds very readily. My subscription of £500 I hope to transmit, in part at least, very soon. . . . You have heard, of course, of the Rev. Dr. Willson having been appointed by the Holy See to the recently erected bishopric of Hobart Town. . . . Until the period of his arrival Van Diemen's Land remains under my jurisdiction, and, consequently, under that of the Vicar-General, by me appointed—that is yourself".

On 11th May, 1844, Dr. Willson reached Hobart. Immediately Father Therry authorised the despatch of an official message to the Lieutenant-Governor that he had "resigned his office of Vicar-General". The new Head of the Church got no cordial welcome, plans for his reception having been neither made nor suggested. Without ceremony he was introduced to a Church the site of which had not yet been paid for and of which the deeds were in the sole name of John Joseph Therry. Close at hand could be seen two other buildings—designed to serve as a residence and a school—in the initial stages of construction. Elsewhere, on land formerly occupied by Father P. Conolly, the pioneer priest, there appeared the foundations of a house and a school, as well as building materials set aside for a second place of worship. The Bishop learned that there was no money to complete the works in hand and that the debt amounted to two or three thousand pounds. Accurate figures could not then be quoted; but whatever the sum, Dr. Willson was expected to bind himself legally to pay it. Such tidings naturally caused alarm. By the earliest mail to Sydney, on 16th May, a letter went to Archibishop Polding expressing surprise that assurances solemnly given in England had no foundation, demanding the recall of Father Therry, and disclaiming responsibility for loans said to have been raised for ecclesiastical purposes in Hobart.

Bishop Willson's attitude did not mean unwillingness to share the load of debt *when known*. Resolved to accept no obligation in civil law, and not disposed to treat with private individuals professing to have claims on their former pastor, he stood all along prepared to dis-

cuss the problem amicably, ready to receive advice and assistance. On 20th May, nine days after his arrival in Hobart, he invited Father Therry to give him a statement showing:

1. The cost of land, buildings; interest and other expenses;
2. The sums received for Church purposes, and their origin;
3. Deeds, plans, contracts—if any.

To this legitimate request no reply was vouchsafed: the question had, therefore, to be approached from another angle. The Bishop then proposed that each party to the dispute should choose two arbitrators, with power to call in a referee in the event of a deadlock. By their decision, as based on an examination of the accounts, Dr. Willson bound himself to abide. The priest, on the other hand, claimed freedom to reject the verdict *unless he thought it a just one.* Several other suggestions coming from the Bishop's advisers failed to open the way to negotiations. Doing his utmost to avert strife, the Rev. Thomas Butler asked Father Therry to invite Cornelius Driscoll and Joseph Riechenberg—two influential Catholics—to audit the accounts with a representative to be appointed by the Bishop. Not even a written promise, signed by these gentlemen and by Dr. Willson, "to return the whole of the papers as soon as they had been inspected", could induce the late Vicar-General to agree. He refused to concur in the selection of any auditor except John Offor. In response to an inquiry, this accountant replied: "It is not in my power to say when a satisfactory statement can be furnished". Thus matters stood when the Bishop set out for Sydney.

Before Dr. Willson's visit to New South Wales, as well as later, Father Therry endeavoured to enlist Government sympathy. As a public servant, apart altogether from ecclesiastical considerations, he considered himself justified in adopting this procedure. On 23rd July he put one aspect of his case before the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir J. E. Eardley-Wilmot:

"The sum at present due for the erection of St. Joseph's Church amounts to £3201/15/5; and for that sum I am personally, and I may say exclusively, responsible. I say *exclusively* because, although the trustees are in law jointly liable with me, yet as they consented to become trustees at my earnest solicitation I feel that I am bound, whatever may be the extent of the sacrifice, to preserve them from the consequences to which they have in law rendered themselves amenable. Bishop Willson has declined to incur any responsibility whatever in the matter; and I am thus left in a position to extricate myself from which unless relieved by Your Excellency, I must become involved in a very serious difficulty".[1]

[1] *Tasmanian Government Records.*

In another statement, written on 16th August, Father Therry argued his title to "leave of absence, after nearly 25 years' colonial service, on full salary for eighteen months or two years". By ceasing to hold the office of Vicar-General he had been deprived of an income, the loss of which he had "no just reason to apprehend". "I am now left", he stated, "without an income from any quarter, with the responsibility of the Church debts as well as my personal ones". All such appeals failed to move the Lieutenant-Governor. His Excellency pointed out that "the sanction of the Crown having been obtained for the appointment of one to take over the duties of Vicar-General, and Mr. Therry's consent having been given, that gentleman has no claim upon the Government other than regret at his difficulties and that respect for his past services which his conduct has so justly entitled him to."[2]

Meantime what did the Archbishop think of the situation? What attitude did he assume? In reply to Dr. Willson's first letter from Hobart he wrote:[3]

"Sydney, June 8th, 1844.

"My dear Lord,

"I acknowledge with much joy your first letter from Hobarton: may many, many long years elapse before the last be recorded. Mine of the same date—16th ult.—with that of Your Lordship, via Launceston, I trust you have received. From it you will learn the anxiety with which I anticipate the great pleasure of an early visit from Your Lordship for the purpose of assisting at the consecration of Dr. Murphy, which will give us the opportunity of conferring on other matters of great importance.

"With respect to Mr. Therry, what can I do, my dear Lord? I do not feel, in fact, that I have power to order him here or there. Whilst within my jurisdiction, of course, I can require obedience or I dispense with his service. To invite him hither and to press his return, from what you have already seen of his character, will lead you to conclude with me would be the means of committing me irrevocably; for if I did not follow up this step by confidence or display of trust in him, he would immediately turn round upon me, and with some show of reason. His ambition has been, is, and will be, to be deemed a martyr, an extremely ill-used man. His great friend, Mr. O'Sullivan, I am told, has advised him to sell his property—purchase an annuity, and retire. Would to God he would take his advice; but the fact of my offering would be sufficient inducement to reject it. He is a pious, zealous, obstinate man, who in the designs of Providence kept alive the embers of religion when a few more capable persons without his peculiarities would not have done half so well. But his days are gone by. Of course, the authority he possessed is absorbed in that of Your Lordship, and I feel confident he will not remain long to trouble you. As regards the debt, I think you are quite right in refusing to take the responsibility. On the other hand, if that responsibility remains with Mr. Therry, I fear the creditors will not permit him to leave the Island until payment is made to secure them. Were the case mine I would call a meeting of the principal Catholics, and plainly state the circumstances. The

---

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Polding's letters to Willson are in Hobart. Copies of Dr. Willson's letters also.

money said to be due from Government I am certain you will obtain, if even a colourable claim can be made out. The Government will be glad to show itself thus favourable to you.

"To Mr. Therry I wrote some two months since, requesting him to have all his documents in readiness to surrender to Your Lordship on your arrival—when his authority as my V.G. would cease. If he desired to return hither I should be happy to see him. This is an advance on that road I think quite as far as prudence will permit."

Every post brought letters to Sydney stressing the danger of serious dissension and the need for prompt and decisive action. What debt existed? Who was going to pay it? Would Father Therry be recalled? To deal with the threatening situation Archbishop Polding made up his mind to go across to Hobart:

"Sydney, July 27, 1844.

"My ever Dear Lord,

"I have this moment heard that the *Louisa* will sail in the morning and I am most anxious to avail myself of the very first means which offer to relieve your mind from the dreadful effects of Mr. Therry's—I know not what word to use. I purpose in God's pleasure to avail myself of the steamer's next trip to come to you via Launceston—I shall bring Mr. McEncroe with me. In the meanwhile, keep my intention a *profound secret;* otherwise other and deeper machinations will be laid. As it is, I think, I see my way thro' present difficulties pretty well.

"You will easily ascertain the time which usually elapses between the visits of the steamer to Launceston, and thus reckon the time proximate to my arrival.

"I trust Your Lordship will be enabled to accompany me on my return. It will relieve your mind much, in case Therry remains, to have on the spot one who understands his schemes as well as Mr. McEncroe, who may stay in Hobarton till you return. I consider I shall be with you as soon, if not sooner, per steamer than by sailing vessel.

"I would advise you to take now as little notice of Mr. Therry as may be: that is, go on as if nothing was the matter. Hoping to find you in good health and cheery, I am, my dear Lord,

"Your most affectionate Brother in Jesus Christ,

J. B. POLDING, Sydn."

A few days later, in a note announcing a definite date for the sailing of a ship for Hobart, the Archbishop issued a word of caution: "It is of consequence that Therry and his clique should not be apprised of my intentions."

On August 10th, with the Rev. James Ambrose Cotham as his companion, Bishop Willson embarked for Sydney. He wanted to ensure Dr. Polding's intervention without undue delay. He assisted at the consecration of the Most Rev. Francis Murphy to the See of Adelaide;[4] helped in drawing up legislation for the Australian Church; and, with the Archbishop's consent, engaged a young priest for the island-diocese. Naturally the crisis in Tasmania formed the chief topic of discussion between the two prelates concerned. When the Bishop

[4]September 8, 1844.

set out for home he was accompanied by Dr. Polding and Father John McEncroe. On September 20th their ship reached Hobart.

The Archbishop got to business right away, having called all parties to Dr. Willson's rooms. The Bishop insisted on an unconditional surrender of the deeds of the site on which St. Joseph's Church stood; as canonically elected ruler of the diocese he was entitled to these and other documents regardless of any promise, condition or restriction. Not in that light did Father Therry view the question. He refused to hand over the property without a legal guarantee that debts contracted by himself for religion and education would be transferred to Bishop Willson. As no one would yield this first conference ended in failure. But Dr. Polding did not give way to discouragement; he forthwith went to Father Therry's private house, and persuaded the priest to give him whatever papers he possessed belonging to the mission. Church accounts and other documents were not at hand: but these would be delivered up in due course.

Pleased with his success the Archbishop considered it his duty to reprimand his former Vicar-General:

"Your conduct towards the Bishop on and since his arrival I perceive with great regret has produced an impression which entirely precludes the hope of bringing matters to the conclusion I so much desired. You are not, you cannot be, conscious how far you have gone beyond the propriety of conduct which ought ever to distinguish the intercourse between the Priest and the Bishop. Why were not the papers, now put into my hands, placed in the hands of the Bishop on his arrival? You had no right over them after your authority as Vicar-General ceased; and it ceased the moment the Bishop reached the shore. Your conduct in this matter the Bishop deems unbecoming to your station and insulting to himself. In 1842 you informed me that the Church was unencumbered with debt; in 1844 upwards of £3000 are due on St. Joseph's Church alone! Again, the manner you have adopted with the trusteeship is in the highest degree culpable. . . . The trustees selected by you are, in fact, no trustees. Is there a deed of trust signed by them to constitute them legal trustees? . . . An apology to the Bishop of Hobart Town, most ample and in the manner he may require, you are in justice bound to make.

"And you must feel sensible that until this be done I cannot conscientiously permit you to exercise any clerical functions within my own jurisdiction in case you contemplate a return to New South Wales."[5]

A lover of peace, Dr. Polding now persuaded himself that patience and tact would restore harmony. Vain were his hopes. Whilst engaged in assorting the papers which he had induced Father Therry to hand over a storm suddenly broke loose. Bishop Willson emphatically declared that he would refuse to accept any documents except from Father Therry in person. Private communications to friends of both

[5]Eris M. O'Brien, *The Life of Archpriest J. J. Therry*, Sydney, 1922, p. 226.

parties speak of the unpleasant scene. However, correspondence of a later period throws more light on the unfortunate episode. Dr. Polding writes to the Bishop of Hobart:

"To my great astonishment, on the 27th September, between two and three in the afternoon, Your Lordship came to my room and very distinctly gave me to understand that, as Archbishop, I had no right to interfere in the temporal affairs of your diocese and that you protested against such interference."[6]

This protest as well as the manner of its expression the Archbishop recorded as one impediment to the success of his attempt at mediation. Let us read Bishop Willson's later defence:

"I am grieved to be compelled to acknowledge the general correctness of this statement. But what, may I be permitted to ask, could induce me to adopt so painful a course? What reasons could exist which could force me to make so painful an objection? Is it to be supposed that I could abruptly enter Your Grace's room without feeling conscious that I had strong reasons for objecting to the exercise of archiepiscopal authority? My Lord, I objected to submit to the exercise of authority I was sure you did not possess. This opinion has since been confirmed by prelates quite conversant with Canon Law, and even by yourself, as we shall soon see. And here I must be allowed to remark that having at that time fresh in my mind all the facts that had transpired in England before the arrangements were made for my coming to Van Diemen's Land it was heart-breaking to find Your Grace could be the individual who should threaten to compel me (as you openly acknowledge now you would have done but for the want of canonical forms) to submit to terms proposed by yourself, I hesitate not to say, oppressive and unreasonable, ungenerous and unjust. . . . And who would not see at once on your arrival at Hobarton that I was to be the bearer of all this man's [Therry's] folly. . . . You were requested by me to visit Hobarton to put me in *the position agreed upon before leaving* my own dear flock and beautiful churches. And what was your first endeavour? Why, to compel me, upon what you termed Archiepiscopal Authority, to take on myself the onus of a debt; neither Mr. Therry nor anyone else could tell the amount! To free Mr. Therry from all future responsibility, either legal or moral; and for me blindfold to have a burden placed upon me of *unknown weight.* My Lord, as a Bishop and, I hope, as an honest man, I did protest against an act of such assumption. Your Grace has said you were wished by me to come as Archbishop to adjudicate between 'me and Mr. Therry'. My Lord, I deny that I ever wrote or said one word that could be interpreted into such conclusion. . . .

"I sailed from England on the faith of Your Grace's word that the Church was free from debt, and that Mr. Therry would not remain in Hobart Town. I arrived here . . . I may say pennyless. . . . On landing I found Your Grace had been led into error—for instead of finding a church 'free from encumbrance' I found an unfinished one, with a debt the *amount of which I was told could not be stated!* It might be £1000, £2000, £3000, or even more! When I asked the question where were the means to liquidate this debt I was at once told that I should be the responsible person—that I should not be an honest man if I refused to do so—that no church documents should be delivered to me unless I would agree to take whatever responsibility there might be, that I was not a fit person to be a Colonial Bishop, etc. This language, and much more such was used towards me almost immediately on my arrival, as I duly informed you at the time. As I was pennyless, had no house to enter, and received no welcome greeting from the Catholic community . . . my position was not an enviable one. But I would not

[6]H. N. Birt, O.S.B., *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia,* London, 1911, vol. II, pp. 107-108.

allow my spirits to be depressed. I felt assured that I had a kind and true friend in you and that you would not allow this person to crush me. . . . I conjured you to compel this person to yield to reason, as you were his ecclesiastical superior, and force him to act with justice to the Church and me. I appealed to you to come and extricate me . . . and, as far as you could, redeem the word you had given me before consenting to be consecrated. I had committed no fault. . . . which required the presence of an Archbishop in Van Diemen's Land to sit in judgment on me. . . . Each ship which left this harbour for Sydney conveyed to you intelligence of the state of things. However, hoping against hope, I strove to have matters arranged . . . as the letters I have preserved will confirm. . . . There is not one word . . . in your letters to lead me to suppose that you intended coming in any other capacity than my friend, to carry out, as far as possible at least, the agreement entered into before I left England. . . . With regard to my refusing to receive the bag-full of papers from Your Grace . . . they were only the correspondence with Government. I wish it to be distinctly understood that the papers referred to were in nowise connected with the erection of St. Joseph's Church, but were only correspondence with Government on a variety of subjects regarding ordinary business. . . ."[7]

Nevertheless, in spite of the frigid atmosphere, something was accomplished. On Saturday, 28th September, a meeting was called at St. Joseph's Church. There Father Therry expressed sincere regret for having withheld from Bishop Willson any ecclesiastical documents. He also declared that the act of now transferring the Church and the other buildings did not exonerate him and his co-trustees—John Regan, William Insley, and Thomas Alcock[8]—from any part of the debt standing against them on account of these properties; and that neither the Archbishop nor the Bishop were responsible for debts contracted by himself in the erection of Church buildings. He asserted his willingness, when called upon by the Bishop to give a full financial statement of receipts and disbursements and to hand over documents relating to the temporal affairs of the Church.

A paper embodying this statement, and signed by Father Therry, the Archbishop, Fathers W. Hall and J. McEncroe, and the three abovenamed members of the laity, was placed in the hands of Dr. Willson.

Having spent a somewhat unhappy week in Hobart the visitors went off to Launceston, whence the earliest boat to Sydney would leave. Almost immediately there arose a misunderstanding as to the interpretation of the paper signed on September 28th. Being asked for his opinion on this question, Dr. Polding sent a reply from Launceston, October 12th:

"With respect to Mr. Therry's observations that the paper by him signed was so signed under the conditions that the responsibilities attached to the Church

[7]Willson to Polding: 17/12/1848.
[8]Not financially interested.

of St. Joseph, etc., were transferred as a debt of honour—no allegation can be more groundless.

"The paper was signed as simply and as unconditionally as the surrender of the property was made into your hands. I regret exceedingly that Mr. Therry should make such assertions; for they cannot be of service, only tend to annoy, and keep open wounds from which religion has and must suffer. I would not take the least notice of them, nor of any of these peculiarities which render the transaction of business with him so difficult. I am still of opinion that a public meeting should be called; a very full expose of the state of the Church made known; means devised, and all parties invited to assist the trustees to meet their responsibilities".

A public meeting of Catholics was called to discuss the situation and to take appropriate action. The accounts had not yet come into the Bishop's possession; but it was agreed to await their delivery and to have them inspected by five gentlemen who would report to a future assembly. At this juncture Father Therry again insisted that no one but Mr. Offor should audit the accounts. When reminded of his pledge signed in presence of Dr. Polding he said he had put his name to the document merely *to please the Archbishop*. This strange assertion was repeated at a later date before a Caveat Board Commission; and again in presence of two diocesan clergy. The only excuse to be made is, perhaps, that when Father Therry lost control of his temper—as he invariably did when others' opinions disagreed with his own—he also lost control of his tongue.

At length, on November 8th, the accounts were sent in to the Bishop: they were transferred immediately to the committee[9] elected to inspect them. Father Therry and his accountant believed there was evidence sufficient to prove a just claim to £3,300. Cornelius Driscoll, on the contrary, spoke the mind of his four colleagues in characterising the documents produced as "a chaotic mass of vouchers, containing multitudinous errors, deficiencies, and discrepancies." Invited to give facts in support of his verdict, Driscoll had no difficulty in doing so. For him, as a good friend of the pioneer priests, and a generous Catholic, the situation created no ordinary embarrassment.

The year moved on to a close with hopes of a settlement fading.

J. H. CULLEN.

(To be continued)

[9]Messrs. Driscoll, Loughnan, O'Meagher, Rowe, and Watkins.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS. V. SACRAMENTAL IMMOLATION.

The Mass is a true sacrifice. The Council of Trent solemnly defined this essential Dogma which had been at the heart of the Church's worship from the beginning. This we all hold with that firmness of mind and will that is born of Faith. Moreover, we have seen that the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is found in the double Consecration alone. One might not clearly see how the essentials of a true sacrifice are fully verified in the sacred moment of the Consecration. One might encounter grave difficulties and even fail to reconcile them fully and positively with the Dogma. Indeed, it would be passing strange if one did not encounter difficulties, for, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, like all the wondrous works of God among men, is clothed with the auroral veil of mystery which, while giving forth some pure light to guide our minds, yet shelters the most inward heart of the divine reality. Even in the act of celebrating this august Sacrifice, the Church, unable to restrain her sentiments of awe and veneration in the presence of the tremendous drama performed beneath the humble appearances of bread and wine, places on the lips of her priests that spontaneous exclamation: "O Mystery of Faith", thereby voicing the persuasion of Christian centuries that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the Mystery of Faith par excellence. One may not clearly see the sacrificial character of the Mass, but one may not doubt. Here we must hold to that oft-repeated axiom that a thousand difficulties do not make so much as one doubt.

It is in the Consecration that we must seek the intimate mystery of the Mass as a true sacrifice. The question, then, is put: *how does the action of the Consecration give us a true sacrifice, the Clean Oblation,* the one and unique sacrifice of the New and Eternal Covenant?

Theologians, particularly after the Council of Trent, have unceasingly concentrated on this question, endeavouring to elucidate the mystery and arrive at a fuller appreciation of the great Christian Sacrifice that they are privileged to handle so familiarly. Little wonder that many and divergent theories have been elaborated. Not only the hidden, mysterious reality that takes place beneath the humble veils of visible, earthly elements, but the very simplicity of the external actions and signs which place the reality before us baffle the mind that tries to

probe this great sacrificial incarnation of Christ's love. Again, many came to the question with minds full of knowledge about physical, bloody sacrifices, and wanted to apply it all to the unique, unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, thinking that if they could not do so they could not show how the Mass was a true sacrifice. It might be well to glance at the main efforts that have been made in order to get our question in its correct perspective.

EXTREMES AND CONFUSIONS.

Two main aspects of the question loom large. The first is the preliminary notion of sacrifice in general. And this has proved a snare to many theologians in generation after generation. They may be called the Destructionist School. Convinced that some *physical destruction* of the victim is absolutely necessary to sacrifice, they embarked on a futile and unlawful attempt to slay or impair the physical Person of the Risen Lord of Life over whom neither death, nor corruption, nor any form of hurt or lesion have the slightest semblance of dominion. Though glorious and impassible, Christ the Victim must somehow become the subject of real, physical destruction, at least equivalently. Some of them, whom we discussed in our preceding article, thought they had discovered what they sought in the destruction of the Victim in Holy Communion. Others, like Cardinals Lugo, Franzelin, and Gasparri, thought that Christ was equivalently destroyed when He was placed in the humiliating condition of the form of food. Great were their names, and unfortunate their influence on the Christian consciousness which fed upon the countless books of piety that absorbed their thoughts and teachings.

They failed to realize the one central truth which should have been a light to their feet as they walked the path of mystery: they failed to realize that *the kind of immolation must necessarily follow the condition in which the victim is present,* that since Christ is *sacramentally* present the only form of immolation possible is *sacramental* immolation. They failed to realize that this sacrifice is thoroughly unique because it is, of its very nature, *a sacramental sacrifice.*

They cut directly across the straight and luminous path of Christian Tradition which knew no other immolation of Christ on the altar save the sacramental immolation. By their passionate eloquence they led souls into a jungle of bewilderment and lost them there on slippery paths, surrounded by numerous tendrils that held them fast while the enemies of the Faith (for love of whom they had deserted the royal highway of Tradition) sneered at their discomfort and frustration.

When the Reformers objected that the Mass was no sacrifice because no physical destruction of the Victim is possible, they should have been content with the answer that Trent itself gave to the objectors, namely, that the Mass is an unbloody Sacrifice performed beneath the sacred signs or species of bread and wine; that it is a sacramental sacrifice, and that for this reason a sacramental immolation is all that is necessary, even as it is the only one possible.

The Destructionist School also lost sight of the one true purpose of the external, visible sacrifice. The voice of the Fathers echoing over the centuries, telling them that "the visible sacrifice is the sacrament, that is, *the sacred sign* of the invisible sacrifice",—the external manifestation of the internal sacrifice of one's own life—fell upon deaf ears. They seemed to seek the physical sacrifice for its own sake, and they could be satisfied with nothing less than a physical destruction, or its equivalent.[1] These were the two fundamental errors of their systems, and they came from a false or inadequate concept of sacrifice in general and its application to the unique sacrifice of our altars.

The second aspect of the question is that of the Mass as a *sacrifice of the present moment,* a true sacrifice here and now celebrated on our altars in every Consecration. In this regard, what seems to us an obvious and inescapable postulate is this: since the Mass is a true sacrifice, Christ the victim *must there be immolated* in some true sense, for, immolation of the Victim is, as we have seen in our article on the notion of sacrifice in general, the element which formally constitutes a sacrifice. Consequently, if the Consecration does not place Christ the Victim in a state of immolation, a state of victimhood, how may we say that the notion of true sacrifice is verified in the Mass?

At this point we encounter another school of thought, the Modern School, headed by Fr. de la Taille, S.J., whose influence on contemporary thought, particularly in lay-circles through the popularization of the contents of his prodigious work, *Mysterium Fidei,* is well known to all. This Modern School does not hesitate to say that in the Mass *there is no new immolation of Christ the Victim.* They would have us believe that the Mass consists essentially in the mere oblation made by the Church of the bloody immolation of Christ which took place on Calvary two thousand years ago. This oblation of the once-immolated Victim formally constitutes the Mass a true sacrifice.[2]

---

[1]Here we should re-read the article on the notion of sacrifice in general, *A.C.R.,* April, 1951, pp. 120 ff.

[2]Cf. *Mysterium Fidei,* pp. 11, 697, 744; 151, 294-301.

Confusion worse confounded! Now we had two schools walking in opposite directions. One cross-road now led to the impossible position of equivalent physical immolation, the other led to the queer, anomolous position of no immolation of the Victim on the altar at all! The broad, open highway of Tradition lay ahead. But it was not so luminous now. The clouds and fog had come down, and in the encircling gloom the people met at the cross-roads with worried brows and asked of one another where they might safely tread. If they had retraced their steps along the main highway of Tradition, there they would have found many a guide to lead them forward on the mysterious way. There they would have found Augustine crying out to the centuries: *"Every day Christ is immolated in this sacrament,* and he speaks the truth who says that Christ is immolated there".[3] There Pope St. Gregory, whose name was the Great, would have assured them that Christ our Lord "although rising from the dead, dieth no more, . . . yet, *while living immortally and incorruptibly in His own Person, is immolated again for us in the mystery of this sacred sacrifice*".[4]

There the whole of Tradition, many of whose illustrious witnesses we shall quote presently, would have attested to the ancient truth that Christ is indeed immolated again and again in every sacrifice of the Mass. There they would have heard the solemn voice of Trent teaching the nations, not once, but thrice, that Christ the Victim is truly immolated beneath the sacramental species of bread and wine.[5]

It is in no way sufficient to say that the Mass is a true sacrifice simply because we offer again the bloody immolation of Calvary which took place two thousand years ago. And this for many reasons. Firstly, the Mass is a true sacrifice *of the present moment,* and, as such, it requires a true immolation of Christ the Victim each time the sacrifice is celebrated. Hence St. Augustine declares: "Every day is Christ immolated in this sacrament". Secondly, Fr. de la Taille's school, by uniting the *physical, bloody immolation* of Calvary with the *sacramental consecration* of the Mass, try to effect an unlawful union between *two realities of totally different orders.* The sacramental order is a thing in a genus of its own; and the physical order likewise. The one cannot be confused with the other, though it may stand in relation to it, as the Mass does to the Cross. Right thinking will not allow us

[3] *Epist. ad Bonifacium,* 98, 9; *PL.* 33, 363.
[4] *Dialogus,* 4, 58; *PL.* 77, 425.
[5] *Denzinger,* 938-40.

to unite these two in one numerical and specific sacrifice, as these theologians would have us do. Thirdly, we cannot accept the contention of this modern school that a sacrifice is formally constituted by the mere *ritual oblation* of the victim. We have seen in our study of sacrifice in general that *immolation of the victim* is that which formally constitutes a sacrifice. A sacrifice is not a victim, nor is it the offering of a victim, but the placing of the victim in a state of immolation in order to express the internal sacrifice of one's own being. Fourthly, Fr. de la Taille's theory is not consistent with the fundamental notion of the Mass as a *sacramental sacrifice.* If the Eucharist Consecration is a true sacrifice, *it must truly immolate Christ the victim;* and since it is a *sacramental sacrifice,* it must immolate Him *sacramentally.*

This last point is one of the greatest importance. We must, absolutely, contain our minds within the limits of the *sacramental order* when we consider the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It is, of its very nature, a sacramental sacrifice, wholly carried out beneath the sacred signs, symbols, or species of bread and wine. This the Council of Trent defined when it asserted that Christ "instituted the New Pasch, Himself, to be immolated under visible signs", the species of bread and wine. (Sess. 22, ch. I.)

Hence it is not lawful to go outside the sacramental economy when we come to consider this sacrifice. All obscurities, confusions, and contradictions creep in when this fundamental truth is neglected or ignored. The Destructionist School ignored it when they sought, with utter futility to find some *physical destruction* of Christ the Victim. The modern school ignores it when they say there is no new immolation of Christ in the Mass, and when they go outside the sacramental sacrifice to find the bloody immolation of Calvary and unite it with the Consecration in one specific sacrifice.

Again, it is not lawful to go outside the sacramental nature of the Mass in search of that element or action which *formally constitutes* the Mass the unique sacrifice that it is. If it is a sacrifice, as we all admit, it must be formally constituted as such by something which takes place under the visible appearances of bread and wine at the sacred moment of the Consecration.

THE QUESTION.

We must clearly understand what it is that we are seeking. The precise point is this: given that the essence of the Mass is found in the double Consecration alone, what happens in the Consecration that gives

it a sacrifical character? Or, more precisely, in the language of the schools, what element in the Consecration is the *formal constituent of the Mass as a true sacrifice?* In a general way, the question may be illustrated by an example. Man is *essentially* composed of body and rational soul. These two elements form his concrete essence, neither the body alone nor the soul alone being man. Now, if it be asked: what, in the essence, is the *formal constituent* of man as man?—everyone will reply that it is the rational soul, for this is the form, the determining principle which specifically constitutes man what he is. Where, then, in the Consecration is found the formal constituent of sacrifice—the action or element which gives to the Consecration (and so to the Mass) its specific sacrificial nature?[6] Everyone will see that the answer to this question must radically affect and govern our whole way of thinking upon this august sacrifice of our altars.

THE ANSWER.

If we are to remain faithful to the principles outlined in this and in the preceding articles, we can give only one answer to this question. It is this:

The Consecration contains a true and proper sacrifice formally and precisely because Christ the Victim is there immolated in an unbloody manner, by the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood under the separate species of bread and wine.

EXPLANATION OF THE ANSWER.

"Sacramental immolation" means simply that Christ the Victim, as contained and visibly indicated by the sacred signs or species of bread and wine, is placed in a state or condition of victimhood resulting from the efficacious words of the Consecration.

Very often this sacramental separation of Christ's Body and Blood is called "mystical immolation". Now, the world "mystical" must not be understood in the sense of "metaphorical". Who would say that the "Mystical Body" of Christ is a mere metaphorical body and not a supreme reality? The word "mystical" means "real, with the eminent reality of the supernatural order". And since the supernatural order is brought into contact with us by visible signs or symbols which

[6]The example, like all examples, is deficient. Man is a physical being having permanent existence in a concrete nature. Hence, the formal constituent of man is an intrinsic principle permanently united to the human organism and constituting an abiding concrete entity. In sacrifice, the formal constituent is the action which immolates the victim. The Consecration formally constitutes a sacrifice precisely because it sacramentally immolates the Victim on the altar.

efficaciously produce what they signify (and are, therefore, called sacramental), the term "mystical immolation" in its full richness means "the immolation of the victim under sacred signs or symbols, produced by the supernatural power of the words of Consecration".

Now, at the moment of the Consecration Christ is present on the altar, not *in specie propria* but *in specie aliena*—under the external form and appearances of bread and wine. He is sacramentally present. But this is not the whole truth. At that sacred moment the *separate* species of bread and wine, in virtue of the *separate* form of Consecration, *separately* contain and indicate as present *here* the Body, *there* the Blood of Jesus Christ, the Victim.

This means that the words of the Consecration, charged with God's omnipotence, have effectively placed Christ in a state or condition of victimhood. His manner of being upon the altar is *sacramental* being; and *His sacramental being is divided*: His Body, as formally contained and indicated by the visible species of bread, is separated from His Blood as formally contained and visibly indicated by the species of wine. It is the great sacramental sign: the victim, as present on the altar, lies in a state of immolation—an external condition of victimhood.

Over the bread the priest pronounces the tremendous words: "This is my Body". *Those words actually cause what they exactly express, nothing more or less.* By virtue of those words, the substance of bread is changed into *the Body of Christ only,* and the remaining species directly contain and immediately indicate as present *the Body of Christ only.*

Over the wine the words are spoken: "This is the chalice of my Blood". Again the words effect precisely what they say, nothing more or less. The substance of wine is changed into *Christ's Blood only,* and the remaining species directly contain and immediately indicate the Blood only. *Here* is the Body, under the solid species of bread; *there* is the Blood, under the liquid species of wine. *The efficacious words of Consecration have separated them sacramentally, under the sacred, visible signs.*

The sacraments, never let us forget it, are not mere empty symbols. They are *efficacious* signs. They actually produce the reality they signify. Thus the Consecration vividly *signifies* the separation of Christ's Body and Blood, and it *produces* this separation. But it produces this separation in the only way possible, and in the manner that

is proper to the very nature of this sacrament, namely, under the visible and separate species of bread and wine.

Thus, any Christian viewing this sacrificial rite clearly sees that Christ our Lord is present on the altar in a state of victimhood. He sees no physical shedding of blood, no futile attempt to slay again the Lord of Life. He hears the words, he knows their power, and he knows that the Body of Christ as formally rendered present, as directly contained under the species of bread, and as immediately indicated by those species, is separated from His Blood as formally rendered present, directly contained, and immediately indicated by the species of wine. He knows that the Consecration not only gives him Christ, not only gives him Christ as a victim, but gives him *Christ here and now in an actual state of victimhood.*

One might object that, de facto, under the appearances of bread there is not only the Body of Christ but also His Blood, Soul, and Divinity. And similarly under the species of wine the whole Christ is present; and, therefore, there is no real separation! But then one would have missed the whole idea of sacramental immolation. It is true that there is no physical separation of Body and Blood. But let us remember that *by virtue of the words* of Consecration, by the force of the sacrament, only the Body is present under the appearances of bread. The Blood and Soul are there for an extra-sacramental reason: they are there by natural concomitance and, as it were, per accidens. Similarly, by virtue of the words, by the force of sacrament, the Blood alone is present under the species of wine. The Body and Soul are there by natural concomitance only. Hence the immolation is *real,* with the reality of the sacramental order: Christ, as sacramentally present, is sacramentally immolated, through the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood, the division of His sacramental being.[6a]

The truth is found in the virtuous mean. Christ is not physically immolated by the violent shedding of His Blood; Christ is not merely symbolically immolated in an empty sign; but Christ, sacramentally present, is sacramentally immolated.

[6a]Notice how the Church in the prayers of the Mass bids us to restrict our minds within the limits of the sacramental immolation. The priest, making the sign of the Cross over the bread (the species after the Consecration) refers to *the Body of Christ only.* Similarly, his actions and words over the chalice refer to the *Blood only.* His words place only the Body under the one, and only the Blood under the other. (Cf. the prayer "Supplices"). Thus She reminds us, in Augustine's phrase: "Hoc agnoscite in pane, quod pependit in cruce; hoc in calice, quod manavit ex latere". (*Sermo* 3; *PL.* 46, 827).

No one has expressed all this more beautifully or more strikingly than that great witness of Tradition, St. Gregory Nazianzen (+ 390). Writing to his priest-friend, Amphilochius, he says: "O holy worshipper of God, when with a word (the words of Consecration) you draw down the Word-Incarnate; *when with an unbloody cutting you divide the Body and Blood of the Lord, using your voice as a sword;* O hasten then to pray for us".[7] Golden words, which vividly express what it is that makes the Mass a sacrifice!

APPLICATION OF THIS DOCTRINE.

At the moment of the Consecration, Christ, the High Priest, offers Himself to the Eternal Father, a living, holy, all-pleasing victim. In the depths of His soul there is the great internal sacrifice, the purest religious disposition of which a human soul is capable. He pours out His whole life, and all that He is, with that immense love of His Father which consumed Him on the altar of the Cross. The deepest sentiments of His filial soul are offered to the infinite majesty and sanctity of the Adorable Trinity. Totally and irrevocably He gives Himself as a victim of adoration, love, reparation. But if He is to offer Himself in a true sacrifice, this internal sacrifice of Himself, this most noble act of inward religion, must be expressed externally in a visible sacrifice. It must be bodied forth in a visible gesture; the soul of religion must become incarnate in a sensible form. Otherwise there can be no true and proper sacrifice.

How shall this be done? Gladly would He give Himself again and again in a visible sacrifice of blood-shedding, as He had done on Calvary, if the honour and sanctity of His Father required it. But this is not required; nor can He suffer physically again, for His Father has glorified Him in an impassible body. How, then, shall He manifest externally the great eternal sacrifice that fills His soul and consumes Him in a holocaust of love? And how shall He give Himself to us, so that His sacrifice might become our sacrifice?

The answer is found in the *sacramental immolation* which is realized by the words of Consecration. By the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood under the separate species of bread and wine, He vividly expresses before His Father and the members of His Mystical Body the perfect internal sacrifice of His whole being. The internal sacrifice of Himself has become incarnate in an efficacious sign. At the same time He has become our victim on our altar, that we might

[7] *Epist.*, 171; *PG.* 73, 279.

unite with Him in offering to the Eternal Father the supreme sacrifice of the perfect religion.

Some have said that sacramental immolation is not sufficient for a true sacrifice. We might answer that it is not only sufficient, but that it is the only immolation possible in a sacramental, unbloody sacrifice, which the Mass is. But let us remember that "the visible sacrifice is the sacrament, *that is, the sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice*". Immolation is not sought for its own sake. Indeed, of itself, it is worthless and pointless. It has value only as a means of expression, a vivid way of externally manifesting the internal sacrifice of one's life and dispositions. How, then, can it reasonably be said that the sacramental separation of Christ's Body and Blood, by means of which He is placed in the external habit or condition of violent death, is insufficient to manifest externally the internal sacrifice of His life and all the life-movements and dispositions of His soul?

An important conclusion from all this is that *the Mass is, of itself, a true, complete, and absolute sacrifice.* In itself, and of itself, it contains all the requisites, external and internal, of a true sacrifice of the present. There we have "the oblation made to God of a sense-perceptible object (the Body and Blood of Christ visibly indicated by the species containing them), which is placed in a state of immolation (by the sacramental separation in virtue of the words of Consecration), in order to signify externally the internal dispositions of soul by which man acknowledged the infinite excellence of God, and proclaims his total submission to Him". It is the *Clean Oblation,* prophesied by Malachias.

VINDICATION OF THIS DOCTRINE.

(A) This doctrine of sacramental, or mystical, immolation is in perfect harmony with all the pronouncements of the Church on the nature of the Mass, and, indeed, seems to be demanded by those pronouncements.

We shall begin with the Decree on the Mass solemnly promulgated by the Council of Trent.[8] First of all, the Council clearly teaches that in the Mass there is *a new immolation of Christ,* specifically and numerically distinct from the immolation of Christ on the Cross. It is specifically different because it is an unbloody immolation; and it is numerically different because the bloody immolation took place once only, whereas the unbloody immolation is daily repeated. "In this

[8]Session 22, Chapters 1-2; *Denzinger,* 938-940.

divine sacrifice which is performed in the Mass, that one and same Christ is contained, and *is immolated in an unbloody way, who, on the altar of the Cross, once only offered Himself in a bloody manner".*[9]

Secondly, the Council teaches that the immolation of Christ in the Mass is a *real-mystical immolation,* a sacramental immolation, performed beneath the species of bread and wine. "Christ, in the Last Supper, instituted the New Pasch, *Himself, to be immolated* by the Church through her priests under visible signs".[10] The glorious and impassible Person of Christ, the Victim, is left untouched. The immolation is not physical, but sacramental: the immolation of the victim of a Clean Oblation.

Thirdly, the Council teaches that in the Mass there is *a new oblation on the part of Christ, the Principal Priest of the Sacrifice,* an oblation numerically distinct from the oblation of Himself on the Cross. "One and the same Christ, *now offering Himself,* through the ministry of His priests, who *then offered Himself* on the Cross, the manner of offering alone being different".[11] The High Priest now offers Himself under the visible species of bread and wine, whereas on the Cross He offered Himself in specie propria. Thus, as Pius XI comments, "He now offers Himself perpetually", unceasingly exercising His Priesthood.

Now, from our simple exposition of sacramental immolation and its application to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, it will readily be seen that these teachings of the Council are there verified in the fullest measure.

Fourthly, the Council asserts that the Sacrifice of the Mass, in accordance with our Lord's will and institution, is *a representation of the Sacrifice of Calvary.* Christ left to His Church "a visible sacrifice, by which that bloody sacrifice, once only to be enacted on the Cross, might be represented, and that its memory might remain until the end of time".[12] The whole of our Tradition tells us that this true, external, analogical representation or showing-forth of Our Lord's Passion is found essentially in the Christian Sacrifice. The Fathers of the Church refer to the Mass as "the symbol, the similitude, the figure, the imitation, the visible sacrament, that is, sacred sign of the Lord's Passion". And St. Thomas, summing up our Catholic Tradition, does not hesitate to say that the Mass is not a sacrifice unless it sacramentally

---

[9] *Denzinger,* 940.
[10] *Denzinger,* 938.
[11] *Ibid.,* 940; *cf.* also 938.
[12] *Ibid.,* 938.

represents the immolation of Christ in the great sacrifice of our Redemption.[13]

Now, who does not see that in the sacramental immolation of the Victim of the Mass at the moment of the Consecration we have a very vivid representation of the violent separation of His Body and Blood which took place on Calvary? *Here,* under the solid species of bread, the words of Consecration place His Body; *there,* under the liquid species of wine, the words place His Blood. Christ the Victim lies on the altar of sacrifice in the external condition of death, and every Christian who looks upon this sacred rite is carried back to the foot of the Cross on which Christ the Saviour paid the terrible ransom for His soul. Calvary is on the altar in a living drama that only the wisdom and love of the God-man could have conceived and placed in our midst.[14]

Thus the doctrine of sacramental immolation admirably and perfectly fulfils the doctrine of the Mass solemnly proclaimed by the Tridentine Council.

We come now to another dogma of our Faith, which the Council presupposes and leaves intact, but which the Church has never ceased to proclaim. The Mass is not only a vivid representation of our Lord's Passion. It is much more; ineffably more. The Mass is *a true renewal, a true representation* of the Sacrifice of the Cross. In the Eucharistic Sacrifice, says Pope Leo XIII, "the supreme sacrifice of Calvary *is renewed in a wonderful way*".[15]

We ask of the Sovereign Pontiff: How is the Sacrifice of Calvary *renewed, presented anew,* on our altars? Is this to be understood in the sense that we merely make an oblation of the victim once for all immolated on the Cross, as Fr. de la Taille and the modern school maintain? No! replies the Pontiff, the Victim is here and now immolated on the altar: "For it is a divine victim *which is here immolated*".[16] We ask further: How is Christ the Victim immolated in the Mass? And the Pontiff replies, summing up in a few precious words the whole of Catholic Tradition: "The Eucharist is no mere empty commemoration

---

[13]*S. Theol.* 3, 79, 7: "Inquantum enim in hoc sacramento repraesentatur passio Christi...habet rationem sacrificii".

[14]This is the teaching of the Catholic Catechism, compiled by Cardinal Gasparri: "The Mass represents the Sacrifice of the Cross because (quatenus) the consecration of the bread and wine, *separately performed,* represents, *by virtue of the words,* the real separation of the Body and Blood, which Christ Our Lord suffered in His bloody death on the Cross". (Q. 387).

[15]Encycl. *Mirae Charitatis,* 29th May, 1902.

[16]*Ibid.*

(of Christ's death), but a true and wonderful, though *unbloody and mystical renewal of it".* And Pope Pious XII repeats the clear doctrine of his predecessor when he says that in the Mass "Christ, the High Priest, *through an unbloody immolation,* does what He already did on the Cross: He offers Himself as a most pleasing victim to the Eternal Father".[17]

The Victim of the Mass is the very Victim of the Cross, and all the merits of the sacrifice of Calvary are now centred in the august sacrifice of our altars to be applied to our souls. Truly, then, the sacrifice of our Redemption, in all its efficacy, is brought to the Christian altar and *renewed* there. But, as the Pontiffs point out, it is renewed there *in a sacramental, or mystical way,* by the sacramental immolation of Christ effected by the words of Consecration.

One of the brightest of the many theological glories of the reign of Pope Pius XII is found in his call to Christendom to return to the traditional doctrine of Christ's sacramental immolation in the Mass, and his strenuous assertion that the Mass is essentially constituted a sacrifice by that mystical separation of His Body and Blood. His words should remove from the minds of the faithful the unhappy confusion which has resulted from conflicting speculations on the part of various theologians. The Holy Father warns us that "it must be emphasised again and again that *the Eucharistic Sacrifice is essentially the unbloody immolation of the Divine Victim, an immolation mystically manifested in the separation of the sacred species and the offering made of them to the Eternal Father".*[18] These words need no comment. They simply tell us that the Mass is constituted a true sacrifice, formally and precisely because Christ the Victim is sacramentally immolated by the Consecration.

The Sovereign Pontiff yet again clearly and emphatically insists on this teaching: "On the Cross . . . the immolation of the victim was wrought by a bloody death, voluntarily accepted. But on the altar, by reason of the glorious condition of His humanity, 'death will no longer have dominion over Him' (Romans, 6, 9), and, therefore, the shedding of His Blood is not possible; nevertheless, in accordance with the plan of divine wisdom, *the sacrificing of our Redeemer (on the altar) is marvellously manifested by external signs symbolic of death.* For, by the transubstantiation of bread into the Body of Christ and of the wine

---

[17]Encyc. *Mediator Dei,* 1947.
[18]*Ibid., Acta Ap. Sedis,* 1947, pp. 548 sq.

into His Blood, both His Body and Blood are really rendered present: but the Eucharistic species, under which He is present, symbolize the violent separation of His Body and Blood. Thus a commemorative showing-forth of His death, which actually took place on Calvary, is repeated in all the sacrifices of the altar, *because by the separate signs (species) Christ Jesus is signified and shown forth in the state of a victim".*

The Catholic Catechism, compiled by Cardinal Gasparri, puts forward the same doctrine: "The Mass is the true and proper sacrifice of the New Law, in which Jesus Christ, through the ministry of the priest, by a mystical immolation, offers to God the Father His Body and Blood under the species of bread and wine".[19]

Now, we have seen above that the Mass is in itself and of itself an *absolute* sacrifice of the present, having everything necessary for a true sacrifice. But, since the Mass essentially contains a representation of Calvary's sacrifice, and since the Mass is a true, though sacramental, *renewal* of that sacrifice, and since, moreover, Christ has willed that the whole virtue of His death, alike for expiation and impetration, should abide in the Eucharistic sacrifice, and there be applied to our souls, we must hold that the Mass is also a *relative* sacrifice, looking back to, recalling, renewing, and drawing its efficacy from Calvary.[20] As regards this point, one may appreciate the internal harmony of the doctrine of sacramental immolation: it shows us that the Mass is formally constituted a true, absolute sacrifice of the present *by that very same action* which makes it a truly relative sacrifice—by the sacramental immolation of Christ effected by the words of Consecration. A beautiful example of the simplicity of the designs of God!

(B) That the Mass is formally constituted a true sacrifice by the sacramental immolation of Christ upon the altar is supported, secondly, by *Sacred Scripture.* When Christ Our Lord instituted this sacrifice and offered it for the first time in the supper-room, He said: "This is my Body, which is given up for you. This is my Blood, which is shed for you". We saw in an earlier article that these words mean that our Saviour's Body and Blood were *at that moment being offered in sac-*

---

[19] *Q.* 385.

[20] There is no contradiction in this statement that the Mass is simultaneously an absolute and relative sacrifice. Thus a son is "absolutely" a man, but simultaneously he is totally related to his parents who begot him; and the creature is totally related to God Who created him.

rifice.[21] Now, it is clear from these words that a true sacrifice is offered in the Mass, not precisely because Christ the Victim is rendered present by the transubstantiating power of the words; not because Christ is placed on the altar under the external form of food; not because there is made there an oblation of the bloody immolation of Calvary; but *precisely and formally because the Body is there delivered up to death and the Blood is there shed by being separated from the Body.* St. Luke's narration tells us that the Blood, *formally and precisely as contained in the chalice,* is there shed in a true sacrifice; and those words of Christ: "My Body which is given up for you", are placed in opposition to the words: "My Blood which is shed for you". Thus the clear meaning is that Body and Blood are sacrificed by being separated one from the other. But a physical, violent separation by bloody immolation of the victim cannot be admitted in the Mass. Therefore, we must conclude that Christ's Body and Blood are sacrificed mystically, by their sacramental separation under the visible species of bread and wine, and that this sacramental immolation of the Victim is the formal constituent of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

(C) Our third argument is drawn from the teaching of the Fathers of the Church. Of necessity, we must restrict our remarks in this sphere or we should never make an end of our discussion. Nor is it necessary to treat the matter fully because the Solemn and Ordinary Magisterium of the Church, which we have outlined, has recapitulated the teaching of Tradition. "Christ is present on the altar", says St. Augustine; "there Christ is slain, there Christ is immolated". But "He is immolated in the sacrament", that is, sacramentally, under the visible and separate species which indicate His state of victimhood.[22] Before the Sacrifice of the Cross, says St. Gregory of Nyssa, "Christ immolated Himself as a victim" at the supper and offered Himself in true sacrifice. There "His Body was slain, immolated in a mysterious sacrifice".[23] Gregory's Cappadocian brother, St. Gregory Nazianzen, teaches that this mysterious immolation takes place when the priest, "using his tongue as a sword, by an unbloody cutting divides the Body and Blood of the Lord" with the words of Consecration.[24] Tertullian, speaking of the reconciled apostate who approaches again the Sacrifice

---

[21] A.C.R., January, 1951; pp. 51 f.
[22] *Ep.* 98, 9.
[23] *Oratio I, in Resurrectionem*; PG. 46, 612.
[24] *Epist.* 171, ad Amphilochium; PG. 73, 279.

of the Mass, says: "There will Christ be slain again for him";[25] and St. Cyril of Jerusalem assures his people that in the Mass "we offer Christ immolated".[26] Similarly, the realist, St. John Chrysostom: "You approach the awful and holy sacrifice: Christ lies immolated on the altar".[27] St. Gregory the Great beautifully expresses the wealth of Tradition deposited in his own person: "Christ, although living immortally and incorruptibly in Himself, is immolated again for us in the mystery of this sacred oblation . . . which always imitates the passion of the Only-begotten Son".[28]

The theologians who followed close on the Patristic era gathered this precious inheritance and transmitted it to the great scholastics. Thus St. Paschasius Radbertus (+ 851) faithfully, in one magnificent sentence, echoes the faith of his Fathers: *"Every day Christ is mystically immolated for us, and the Passion of Christ is given to us in this mystery"*.[29] And again: "We ever *renew* the memory of his sacred death by immolating daily His most holy Body and Blood on the altar".[30] Thus, also, Yvo of Cortona (+ 1116), repeating the words of Augustine, which run like a golden thread through the web of Tradition: "He speaks the truth who says that the impassible and immortal Christ is daily immolated in this sacrament".[31]

The scholastics received this doctrine in all its purity and clarity, and passed it on to us with fidelity. Peter Lombard (+ 1160) stated it succinctly in his famous "Sentences" and this placed it in all the schools of the middle ages. The voices of Augustine and Gregory speak again in his pages: "Christ died once on the Cross and was there immolated in His physical Person; but daily is He immolated in the Sacrament".[32] His greatest commentator, St. Thomas Aquinas, explains how Christ is immolated there, namely, by the sacramental separation of His Body and Blood by the efficacious words of the Consecration.[33] Then followed Bonaventure, Cajetan, Capreolus, John of St. Thomas, and, to the present day, an army of theologians almost without number. The doctrine of sacramental immolation alone is the traditional teach-

---

[25] *De Pudicitia*, 9.
[26] *Catechesis Myst.* 5, 10; *PG.* 33, 517.
[27] *Homilia 2 in Prod. Judae*, n. 6.
[28] *Dialogus*, 4, 58; *PL.* 77, 425.
[29] *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, c. 9, n. 1; *PL.* 120, 1294.
[30] *Ibid.*, c. 9, n. 2; *PL.* 120, 1295.
[31] *Decretum*, pars 2, C. 4.
[32] 4 *Sent.*, d. 12, p. 2, C. 5.
[33] *Com. in Corinth.* C. 11, lect. 6; *In Matth.*, 26.

ing of our Faith, obscured now and then by temporary innovations, usually the result of unfortunate historical circumstances, but shining forth to-day with such splendour that some do not hesitate to say that the Church could define as a Dogma of Faith not only that Christ the Victim is sacramentally immolated in the Consecration, but that the Mass is, as Pius XII has stated, essentially constituted a sacrifice by that mystical immolation.[34]

(D) In conclusion we offer a brief theological consideration. Given the doctrine of sacramental immolation we can fully appreciate why Christ our Lord instituted the Eucharist under the two species of bread and wine. On the one hand, the internal sacrifice of the divine victim must be effectively expressed externally. Hence the transubstantiation of bread into His Body and of wine into His Blood, effecting the sacramental separation of Body and Blood externally manifested by the separate species. Given the impassible state of Christ's glorious humanity, this sacramental immolation is the only one possible, and yet it is abundantly sufficient for its purpose, namely, the external signification of the internal sacrifice. On the other hand, the Eucharistic sacrificing of the Divine Victim must necessarily represent the violent separation of His Body and Blood on Calvary. Hence, again, the necessity of the two species which, formally containing the Body of Christ sacramentally separated from His Blood, simultaneously indicate the Victim in an external state of death commemorative of Calvary's supreme sacrifice. The Mass is the sign of the Cross: a living, dynamic sign which reproduces the reality it so vividly signifies.

A new day is born. The priest stands at the altar of Sacrifice. He is a man of Blood. He lends his tongue to the Word-Incarnate: Omnipotence rests easily upon his lips. The Words are spoken: the Lamb is slain; Christ lies immolated on the altar. And heaven and earth are reconciled for yet another day.

THOMAS MULDOON.

---

[34] We do not mean to say that the Fathers precisely formulated the question: What is the formal constituent of the Mass as a sacrifice?—and answered the question in concise scholastic terms. But it is quite evident that for the Fathers of the Church the sacramental immolation of Christ on the altar by the words of Consecration is the central point of the sacrifice. If one were to ask the Fathers: what takes place in the Mass?—they will all reply: "There Christ is immolated, Christ is slain, on the altar; not by a physical shedding of His Blood, but by a sacramental separation of Body and Blood". For them the sacrifice consisted in that wonderful action. Hence, they taught equivalently that the formal constituent of the Mass as a sacrifice is found in the sacramental immolation. Their words can have no other meaning.

Moral Theology

SOME PROBLEMS OF NURSES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Could you kindly indicate some general principles which would be a guide to nurses in the discharge of their duties? In particular, I would be grateful for a short treatment on the obligation to feed by artificial means an unconscious senile patient, whose life expectancy is limited to a few weeks. You may further help by some remarks on the use of narcotics, especially in the case of incurable invalids.

OCCIDENTALIS.

REPLY.

1. The duties of a nurse may, we think, be stated generally as follows: She attends the sick, under the direction of the doctor in charge of the case. Her office is to help the patient who cannot help himself. Consequently, she must not disregard his rights, especially his fundamental right to live; and she must endeavour to fulfil the wishes of her patient which are considered reasonable in the circumstances. Her obligations in these matters are always of charity; and if she is in receipt of a professional fee, they become also obligations of justice. Further, she is bound in charity to consult for the spiritual welfare of her charge, particularly as he nears his end.

a) The primary duty of the nurse is to attend the sick, within the limits of what is expected according to the accepted rules of her profession, custom and any special agreement that may be entered into. Attendance on the sick means providing them with what is necessary for their recovery, if there be hope that recovery is possible; or making their situation as tolerable as circumstances allow, when the case is incurable. The nurse sees to the usual wants of the patient: his bed, clothing, cleanliness, nourishment, etc., and she administers whatever medicines or treatment are prescribed or implied by the doctor.

b) The nurse carries out her duties under the direction and supervision of the doctor: her position is subordinate. The responsibility for the patient rests in the first place on the conscience of the doctor whom the nurse should recognise as her superior in the duties of her profession. She is thus bound to obey the doctor in all things lawful. If instructed to do something with regard to the patient which is contrary to the code of Christian morality, she should with deference but

firmness decline to do so. At the same time, she should be conscious of her own limitations and of her lack of knowledge in comparison with that of the doctor. In case of doubt, she would be justified, for the present, in giving the benefit of it to her superior. At the first opportunity, she should seek advice from some better informed person, e.c., a more experienced nurse. If certain that she is being asked to do what is morally not permissible, and the doctor insists that his orders be carried out, she should bring the matter under the notice of whoever is responsible for engaging that particular medical attendant—the Hospital authorities, or in the case of a private patient, the sick man or his relatives. In the great majority of cases, we venture to state, her fears will be without foundation. The standard of medical ethics is very high, and the members of the profession would not willingly do anything to lower it. Unfortunately, it may happen that a doctor who is not instructed in the principles of Catholic moral teaching, may see no harm in prescribing remedies or treatment that could not be reconciled with true morality. But even in this contingency, he would, as a gentleman, have respect for the conscientious convictions of others, and we believe there are few doctors indeed who would wish the nurse to violate her religious principles in order to obey their instructions.

c) The sick person is unable to help himself; in the language of the schools, he is in a condition of *physical necessity*. For this reason he calls on the doctor and the nurse to assist him. They are then under the obligation to do for him what he cannot do himself, to help him in his need. If they offer their services gratuitously, their obligations remain those of charity; if they are in receipt of a fee, there arises the bond of justice. Since they act in the interests of the patient and for his good, they will endeavour to fulfil his lawful wishes. Some of these he may make known to them personally or through his friends, others will be implied. It can be taken for granted that his predominant desire is to recover as quickly and as completely as he can; and it is for the nurse to co-operate with the doctor to bring about this happy result, and do nothing that may hinder it. When the disease is incurable it can be presumed that the invalid wishes to live as long as the medical assistance at hand can enable him to do so, and that, in the meantime, his condition will be as tolerable as it can be made, when all circumstances are taken into account. The nurse should be willing to do what she can in this regard. The virtue of charity urges us to help our neighbours in his time of need. If he would die without our assistance, we

are bound even with grave inconvenience to ourselves to succour him; if he cannot do much for himself, we are bound to bring him aid with some trouble to ourselves. These statements are the bare minimum required by the virtue of charity, but the nurse, whose vocation in life is to attend the sick and helpless will not be satisfied with what is obligation: her spirit of sympathy for the suffering will prompt her to do all in her power to assist them. Should the nurse be in receipt of a professional fee for her attendance ,the virtue of justice also will demand that such services as we have mentioned be rendered faithfully, even with serious inconvenience and difficulty; and in addition any other care or treatment must be given which is agreed upon as being due for the fee which is requested.

d) The nurse must ever be careful to respect the rights of her patient, and especially his most fundamental right, which is the right to live. She should not do anything that would *directly* cause the death of her charge; neither, unless there is sufficient reason, can she *indirectly* bring about his departure from life. So much is written and said these days about sparing people from useless suffering by a quick and painless death, etc., that the Catholic nurse would need to be on her guard not to be deceived by so much nonsense. Nothing which Almighty God sends is useless, and suffering can have very salutary effects; it makes us more like our divine Model, Jesus Christ, Who chose to go to death in the midst of excruciating torments. Further, God alone is the author of life and death. He has said in the fifth commandment: "Thou shalt not kill", and these words have equal force whether the person killed has a life expectancy of years or merely a few minutes. Consquently, the nurse cannot administer what is intended to "end the patient's sufferings". The desire to end his sufferings may be excusable in those who see no good in suffering, but the means employed, the taking of life, is never justifiable. The nurse, for instance, could not, even under the doctor's orders, give the patient such an overdose of a drug which would be sufficient to bring about his death, nor could she continue a series of doses which would inevitably culminate in his death. Murder is always murder, and to call it euthanasia does not alter its nature or make it less culpable. To hasten the person's death indirectly is not always forbidden; it is lawful if there be sufficient reason. Death would be caused only *indirectly* if the drugs or other remedies which have their immediate and natural effect the alleviation of the disease or its symptoms, were given solely for that purpose, although there was a *likelihood* that death

might follow. On the other hand, if death will inevitably and *necessarily* be the result of the treatment, to administer it is to take life *directly*. When there is merely a probability that death may supervene because of the presence of other conditions unfavourable to the patient, the administration of the treatment is equivalent to running the risk of ending his life. It is evident that to run the risk of producing an evil effect is not the same as to be responsible for an action that of necessity must bring about an effect against the moral law. It is also evident that it is wrong to run risks with our lives or the lives of our neighbours without necessity; but if there be sufficient reason, the risk is justified, provided the gravity of the cause and the nature of the risk are proportionate. Many surgical operations contain an element of risk, sometimes a remarkable risk. If the operation is necessary to ward off what would otherwise be certain death, it is justified, notwithstanding that the risk of the operation be considerable. The greater the risk involved, the more serious must be the disorder it is intended to cure. If the operation meant certain death, it would obviously not be lawful to perform or undergo it: the patient would have to be resigned to wait till God's Providence delivered him. A patient, who underwent a necessary but dangerous operation which proved fatal, may be said to have met his death as the result of an unfortunate accident; the operation killed him, but only indirectly. We have used the surgical operation as an example from which it may be deduced that the nurse may sometimes be justified in running a risk with the lives of her patients, though it is never permitted to her to do what would necessarily bring about his death.

It may be asked whether it is lawful to give treatment which has a beneficial effect at the moment but will eventually shorten the patient's expectancy of life? If the truth be known, most of us probably hasten our deaths one way or another, some by excess in the use of the good things of the world, others perhaps by neglect. The compensations, however, are such, and the effect of shortening our lives so remote, that we are not troubled in conscience. Likewise, in the case of a sick man, remedies may be given to alleviate very distressing symptoms, even though it be foreseen that some shortening of life is possible. The immediate effect of these remedies is to give relief to the patient, and no one will dispute that this is what he can lawfully desire. The nature of the drug, or the quantity of the doses administered, may have some detrimental effect on the human system, but will not cause death. It will expose the person to other dangers which will probably, or even certainly,

bring death sooner than otherwise. The primary effect of the treatment is to better the present condition of the patient; the shortening of life is only secondary and for its eventuality depends on many other circumstances beyond human control. When death does come, it is only indirectly the result of what is done now. Consequently, it is lawful with sufficient reason to give treatment which will contribute somewhat to shorten life. The greater the influence in the acceleration of death of the remedy given, the more desperate will the condition have to be that it is called on to relieve. It must be remembered that in no case would it be lawful to give the patient what, in his present condition, would have the necessary effect of bringing about his death. The *finis operis* would be his premature departure from life, and the *finis operis* is always directly voluntary.

e) The nurse in discharging the acts of corporal mercy should be mindful of the spiritual needs of her patient, and provide opportunities for him to receive the Sacraments and perform acts of religion of which he is capable. As death approaches she do all in her power to help him to accept it from the hand of God and to make appropriate acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, as well as Contrition for his sins.

2. With these principles in mind, let us examine the questions that have been raised.

The first of these concerns the obligation to give nourishment by artificial means to an unconscious senile patient whose expectancy of life is definitely limited to a few weeks. The answer depends on what we said above: The nurse does for the patient what he is unable to do for himself, and she should fulfil his lawful requests. It follows immediately that if he is bound to seek nourishment by the use of artificial means, she is bound to give it to him. For every man, even a sick person, there is an obligation to preserve life by what would be considered ordinary means. It is always to be presumed then that the patient desires that the measures usually employed in cases like his own be also available to him, that he may be kept alive even though unconscious. For instance, he should not be allowed to smother or choke, and if he be still capable of taking food and drink in the usual way, they be not withheld from him. Apart from professional reasons, such an obligation would seem to urge from fraternal charity.

As a general rule, a person is not obliged to preserve his life by the use of extraordinary means. He is, however, entitled to use the extraordinary means if they are within his attainment. How is the nurse

to arrive at a knowledge of the wishes of an unconscious patient? She may be able at least to conjecture from his former manner of life, v.g., if he always sought the best medical attention and did not grudge the expenses of special treatment, and there is sufficient in his estate to meet the charges of what is now thought expedient. Failing such an indication, the legal guardians of the patient would be called on to make the decision. These would be his next-of-kin, or the head of the institution of which he was an inmate. A nurse who is attending a sick person merely out of charity is not bound to undertake the administration of extraordinary means of nursing care. On the other hand, if she is receiving remuneration for her services, she should, in justice, do what her lawful superiors—more crudely, her employers—ask her to do. If she is working on a private case she has implicity contracted with the patient or his relatives to carry out the doctor's instructions. A hospital nurse agreed, when accepting the position, to perform all the duties of her profession that were to be entrusted to her by the authorities in charge of the hospital. If those actually responsible for prescribing and sanctioning the treatment, which is an extraordinary means of preserving life, request that the treatment be given, the nurse who accepts a professional fee cannot in justice neglect to administer it.

The question arises: What is meant by an extraordinary means of preserving life? We may be near the truth if we say that it includes the medicines, nursing, etc., usually adopted by persons in the same condition of life as the patient. In these days, when public hospitals are available and medical attention is provided from the contributions of the taxpayer, there are scarcely any means which, from the consideration of expense, are extraordinary; practically every life-saving device is at the disposal of all members of the community, free of cost. The extraordinary nature of the remedy is to be judged not by the expense or inconvenience of procuring it, but rather by the difficulty of administering it and the distress of the patient who is subjected to it. Is artificial feeding an extraordinary means of preserving life? For a patient with a hope of recovery, we do not think it is, and venture to say that few patients would refuse to submit to the ordeal. An unconscious patient, whose days are limited by reason of the very nature of his disease, is in a different category; and it seems to us that artificial feeding would be an extraordinary means of keeping him alive. There would be no obligation on his relatives, etc., to ask that it be done, though they may request that the spark of life, even in an incurable,

unconscious person, be kept burning by use of this means. If they do so, it is plainly the duty of the nurse engaged for a professional fee, to do what is in her power to fulfil their request.

3. The question of the use and administration of narcotics has already been touched on. As the name suggests, their primary effect is to produce a state of drowsiness more or less complete, according to the condition of the patient and the quantity of the drug taken. There is a limit to the amount which the human system can absorb, and an overdose can be the cause of death. Used with discretion, they can be a valuable aid in reducing pain and helping in the recovery of the patient or making the last days of the invalid easier to bear. While their flagrant abuse, as we have just noticed, can easily bring about the death of the patient, their use can sometimes be open to objection, firstly because it can bring about a total loss of consciousness, and again because it can hasten death.

A temporay loss of consciousness for the sake of the general good of the body is admitted by all to be lawful. But to administer morphia or some similar drug in such quantities that the dying man is kept unconscious till, to outward appearances, he passes peacefully to his eternity, is quite another matter. It places the patient beyond the possibility of merit and deprives him of the benefit of accepting death with an act of resignation to the divine Will. Further, the unconscious patient can be helped with certainty only by the Sacrament of Extreme Unction: and the efficacy of the Anointing will depend on his dispositions, which he cannot change while he is incapable of a human act. It is not difficult to conceive of a case in which the eternal salvation of a soul will depend on the state of consciousness at the last moments. Should he be allowed to suffer eternally in the next life rather than be permitted to undergo some suffering now? For these reasons, it is generally not permitted to administer drugs in such doses that the patient will, by reason of them, die whilst unconscious. Theologians, however, take a more lenient view if the dying man has already made his peace with God and his pains are such that they are beyond endurance. In such circumstances, it is permitted to ease the sufferings by a drug, even though it be foreseen that it will terminate the patient's conscious life.

With regard to the second objection against the administration of the drugs—that they hasten death—we have already said sufficient. Unless the general benefit to the patient, which is the immediate result

of the drug, is proportioned to the shortening of life to be expected, their use would be unlawful.

What is to be thought of the case when the sick person has been given such quantities of a drug that their cessation would bring about his death? To allow the patient to reach such a stage is rarely justified, except in the case of those who would find their infirmity unbearable without the help of the drug. If, however, this stage has been reached it would not be lawful to break off the administering of the drug with danger to the life of the patient; medical science knows ways and means of weaning him off the narcotics without serious danger or harm.

Perhaps we may sum up the morality of the use of drugs in sickness, whether incurable or not, as follows:

To administer narcotic drugs in such a way that they have only a beneficial effect is obviously a good and laudable act.

The administration of such drugs which has also a detrimental effect is permissible, when the good effect is the immediate effect, and the evil which also follows does not, according to prudent estimation, outweigh it.

The administration of a drug in such a manner that it causes only an ill effect—the decline or death of a patient—is always unlawful.

To administer a drug which is necessary for recovery or to prolong life, is not only permissible, it is usually of obligation, since it is generally an ordinary means of preserving human life.

In estimating the over-all effects of the narcotic, the spiritual good of the patient must not be forgotten; in fact, it is to be considered as of paramount importance.

This query has already exceeded the usual limits of space. Let us then conclude with what we hope may be a few principles to guide the nurse:

1. When the doctor is justified in ordering the drug, the nurse acts lawfully when she administers it. Conversely, if the use of the drug is unlawful, the nurse cannot give it to the patient.

2. The gravity of the sin committed by the nurse in unlawful administration of a drug would depend, in the first place, on the seriousness of the ill effects to the patient.

3. The gravity of the sin would also depend on the part played by the nurse in the unlawful administration of the drug. Formal co-operation in a sinful act is always forbidden, and the co-operator is not

less guilty than the principal agent. Material co-operation is generally also unlawful, but it may be justified for sufficient reason. To give an injection or place the tablet on the person's tongue is formal co-operation in the administering of the drug. To prepare the patient or the instruments for some one else to do these or similar actions is material co-operation, proximate, it is true, but excusable with sufficiently grave reasons.

4. To give an injection or series of injections, etc., which can only lead to the death of the patient is always sinful. Likewise, if such treatment must bring about a condition in which the life of the patient is in danger, unless there is some compensating good also to be expected, it is also gravely sinful.

5. To give treatment with drugs which is aimed at producing a condition which will be the starting point of further treatment which will kill the patient would usually in itself imply an infliction of harm on him for no justifiable cause, and so would be forbidden. Considered as co-operation in the sin of homicide which the nurse—in the hypothesis—has reason to suspect, it is material, not formal; but as it is already sinful, that aspect need not be examined further.

PLACE FOR HEARING MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Apropos of the question as to where one may satisfy for the precept of assisting at Mass, the following considerations appear to be apposite:

1. It is not uncommon for canonists to express the view that a list given in some particular Canon of the Code is not taxative, or comprehensive. Is not this possible in regard to canon 1249, especially in view of this other fact, viz.:

2. The Index of the Code itself says that one may fulfil the precept of assisting at Mass *ubivis, exceptis oratoriis privatis?*

I conclude, therefore, that there is at least a probability of law that one may fulfil the precept in question anywhere apart from private oratories.

B.J.C.

REPLY.

Some of the lists given in the Code are not to be taken *taxative,* i.e., as exhausting all the cases included under the particular canon, but rather *demonstrative* in that they give instances from which one may conclude the real meaning of the law and the nature of the matter which it covers. As an example, we may refer to can. 138, where a list is

given of what clerics should avoid as unbecoming their state. Our correspondent suggests that the enumeration of places in can. 1249 as suitable for the satisfying of the precept of hearing Mass may likewise not be exhaustive.

In writing in the April issue of the *Record* (p. 134 seq.) we did not explicitly touch on this aspect of the question, though we did state: "It (the Code) seems to enumerate the places where Mass may be heard, and does not include Mass on a portable altar, except in one instance—when it is said in the open". Nevertheless, we implicitly agreed that the list was not given *taxative* when we admitted that Mass could be heard to fulfil the precept in places other than those enumerated in the canon. We did not, however, give it as our opinion that Mass said *in any place whatsoever* on a portable altar would suffice for the Mass of obligation. The condition required was that the Mass be not celebrated merely for the convenience of the priest or an individual or family, but with some reference to the general benefit. Our conclusion was: "It is reasonable to hold that the Mass said on a portable altar with due ecclesiastical permission will satisfy the obligation of all who hear it, if it is permitted for a reason which has in view the public good; which if the Mass is allowed for a private reason it avails only those who were in the intention of the Superior who granted the permission". This conclusion is based on an analogy with the law regarding private oratories.

When interpreting the canon it may not be out of place to ask: If the list of places where Mass may be heard is not exhaustive, can we be sure that the one place noted where assistance at Mass will not fulfil the precept (a private oratory unless, etc.) is the only one not suitable? If the enumeration of suitable places is intentionally incomplete, can it be maintained definitely that the places which cannot serve for a Mass of precept are exclusively restricted to one class?

As an argument for the probability of the contention that any place other than a private oratory suffices, our esteemed correspondent cites the Index of the Code. While noting that the Index of the Code is not a portion of the Law or an authentic interpretation of the Law, we readily admit that it may throw a great light on its meaning, especially as it is connected with so great a name as the late Cardinal Gasparri, to whom we are in a great measure indebted for the Code itself. However, the general purpose of an index is not to clarify what is contained in the work to which it is attached, but to give an indication

as to where information desired can readily be sought: of necessity, its terms are general. *Ubivis,* according to the dictionaries, means *anywhere at all,* but used in an index it could, we think, reasonably mean *any one of the places in question.*

A doctrinal interpretation of can. 1249 would, apparently, remain doubtful, while the doubt of law remained, the faithful could not be obliged to hear another Mass, after being present at one celebrated on a portable altar. There is, however, a passage in an Instruction of the S. Congregation of Sacraments (1 October, 1949. XXXXI. p. 504) which we unfortunately overlooked in the April issue, and it seems to determine the issue: "To prevent other abuses the Apostolic See usually adds some clauses to the indult (of a portable altar) and is accustomed to declare whether the granting of the privilege is also of avail for satisfying the precept on behalf of the faithful who assist at the Mass. But if it is not expressly provided for in the indult, the teaching of Gattico (*De Usu alt. port. opusculum.* cap. XV, n. 14) must be born in mind: 'As regards others (besides those in whose favour the indult is given) who are present (at Mass celebrated on a portable altar) it is well known that *they in no wise satisfy the ecclesiastical precept of hearing Mass, unless the communication of the privilege is expressly extended to them*'. If, however, by virtue of the indult,Mass is celebrated in the open, from what is stated in can. 1249, each one of the faithful assisting, satisfies the law hearing Mass".

This seems to agree with what we wrote in the April issue of the *Record.*

JAMES MADDEN.

Canon Law

I. MIXED MARRIAGE DISPENSATION—A THIRD GUARANTEE.

Dear Reverend Sir,

In our Diocese, before a dispensation from mixed religion is granted, the parties must give in writing two guarantees—the one, given by the Non-Catholic party, that all danger of perversion shall be removed from the Catholic party—and the other given by both parties that all the children who may be born of a marriage will be baptised and brought up in the Catholic Faith.

I am informed reliably that in another Diocese a third guarantee is required, namely, from the Catholic party, to endeavour prudently to secure the conversion of the non-Catholic party. This third guarantee is amongst the conditions for validity of the dispensation.

The question now has arisen as to the sufficiency of the requirements of our own Bishop, or, alternatively, as to the correctness of the method of the other, as both Ordinaries grant dispensations by virtue of the same Formula of faculties. If our Bishop grants a dispensation validly without requiring the third guarantee, is the other Bishop acting according to the Code of Canon Law in requiring it? Will you kindly elucidate this situation? JOANNES.

REPLY.

There is no good reason to regard either of the procedures outlined in the query as uncanonical.

(i) The requirements of the Code of Canon Law are stated in Canons 1061 and 1062.

Canon 1061, *para.* 1. "The Church does not dispense from the impediment of mixed religion unless (i) there are just and grave reasons there for; (ii) the non-Catholic party shall have given a guarantee to remove all danger of perversion from the Catholic party, and both parties shall have given guarantees to baptise and educate all the children in the Catholic faith alone; (iii) there exists moral certainty that the guarantees will be fulfilled".

para. 2. "The guarantees are as a rule to be required in writing".

Canon 1062. "The Catholic party is obliged to strive prudently for the conversion of the non-Catholic party".

It is evident, therefore, that only the first two guarantees are necessary for the valid and lawful granting of a dispensation as far as the law of the Code is concerned. It should be noted that in earlier times the

third promise was required as a prior condition to the granting of a dispensation. Gradually, the law became less exacting, setting forth the obligation which is incumbent on the Catholic party, prudently to endeavour to bring about the conversion of the other party, but refraining from requiring a formal promise that this obligation will be carried out.

It follows that the first Ordinary of the query acts correctly, as he is carrying out the requirements of the Code. He is assuming that the Catholic party is aware of his obligation, which arises from the Divine Law and which should be explained, if necessary, by the priest who makes preparation for the marriage.

(ii) However, in virtue of his office as pastor of a diocese, an Ordinary may require particular safeguards to offset the dangers inherent in mixed marriages. Thus, for example, it is an established practice in many parts of the world that the non-Catholic party must receive a certain number of instructions in the Catholic faith prior to the dispensation being granted. Certainly, there is no such requirement in the Common Law. In the same way, the Ordinary could require a formal guarantee concerning the fulfilment of the obligation recorded in Canon 1062.

As to whether the observance of such a particular law is a condition for the validity of the dispensation depends entirely upon the will of the Ordinary who dispenses. Using faculties delegated by the Holy See, he may grant or refuse a dispensation in consideration of the circumstances of particular cases. In the same way, he may grant a dispensation to be effective only under certain specified conditions.

* * * *

II. SUNDAY MASS IN CONVENT CHAPEL.

Dear Reverend Sir,

In a certain parish there is a long established custom for some parishioners to attend Mass on Sunday in the chapel of a certain Convent within the confines of the parish. The pastor is desirous of changing this state of affairs and claims that, notwithstanding the long established custom, these people are not rightly fulfilling their obligation of Sunday Mass.

What rights has the pastor in this matter?

PETRUS.

REPLY.

(1) There can be no doubt whatever that the parishioners in ques-

tion fulfil their obligation of assisting at Mass on Sunday. Independently of any long established custom the positive law of the Code puts this beyond doubt. Canon 1249: "The precept of hearing Mass is fulfilled by being present at Mass celebrated in any Catholic rite either in the open air, or in any Church or public, or semi-public, oratory, or in the private Cemetery Chapels mentioned in Canon 1190, but not in other private oratories unless this privilege was granted by the Holy See". It may be presumed that the Convent Chapel has the status of a semi-public oratory, and therefore assistance at Mass in this Chapel is explicitly sanctioned as a method of fulfilling the obligation of Sunday Mass.

(2) If it is a question of rights, it cannot be said that a pastor's rights in this matter are very impressive. His course is to exhort and persuade his parishioners to attend their parish Church, but there is no compelling Law which he may invoke.

In times past the law of the Church required parishioners to assist at Mass in their own parish Church on Sundays and days of obligation. By universal custom this law gradually became obsolete and now the positive law of Canon 1249 is quite contrary to the ancient practice. The general principle concerning parochial affiliation is enunciated in Canon 467, paragraph 2: "The faithful are to be admonished to come frequently to their parish Churches when they can conveniently do so, there to assist at the Divine services and to hear the word of God". A particular application of this principle is found in Canon 859, paragraph 3, concerning the obligation of Paschal Communion: "The faithful should be advised (suadendum) to fulfil this precept in their own parish, and those who have satisfied it in another parish should take care to advise their own pastor that the precept has been fulfilled". In any case, the pastor might well achieve his purpose better by helpful explanation. For instance, he might explain a Pastor's obligation to his flock concerning administration of the Sacraments, especially to the sick and dying, or the institution of the Mass pro populo as a personal obligation on the pastor. Considerations of good example may carry weight in influencing the parishioners to attend their own parish Church.

* * * *

III. CHILDREN BAPTISED IN HERESY—THEIR RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH.

Dear Reverend Sir,

A Catholic mother has had two children, aged eight and four years

respectively, baptised and brought up as members of the Anglican Church. Now she seeks to be reconciled with the Church and to return to the practice of her religion, and has presented herself, along with her two sons, whom she asks should be baptised as Catholics. The father is agreeable to this procedure. What course should be adopted in baptising or receiving into the Church these children?

PASTOR.

REPLY.

(1) The younger child, being four years of age, undoubtedly is an infant in Law. Canon 745, paragraph 2: "When it is a question of baptism the term 'parvulus' or 'infans' means in accordance with Canon 88, paragraph 3, one who has not yet attained the use of reason; and persons insane from infancy are regarded as equivalent to these no matter what age they may be". Therefore, this child should be baptised as any other infant, except for the fact that the baptism is conditional. As in the case of infants generally, baptism should not be delayed unnecessarily.

(2) The other son, who is eight years of age, may be presumed to have attained the use of reason, in which case he is to be classed as an adult, for purposes of baptism. "The term 'adults' applies here to those who have the use of reason". (Canon 745, paragraph 2, No. 2). In order to receive Baptism validly, an adult must have the required intention, at least an habitual intention, of receiving the Sacrament. Furthermore, for a fruitful reception of the Sacrament, he must have sufficient knowledge and, also, must have sentiments of attrition. Therefore, this child must be instructed according to his capacities before he is re-baptised conditionally. No doubt there will be a question of instructing him to make his first Confession and receive first Holy Communion. At an appropriate time in the course of his instructions for the reception of these Sacraments, he should be re-baptised in the Catholic Church.

It should be noted that, according to the terms of Canon 745 quoted above, "infans" as far as Baptism is concerned are those who have not yet attained the use of reason. There is a legal presumption that those who have completed their seventh year have attained the use of reason and that those who have not yet reached this age have not attained the use of reason. However, this presumption yields to fact. Therefore, it may well be that the child of eight has not yet attained the use of reason, and in that case he should be baptised as an infant. On the

other hand, it is quite possible that in similar circumstances a child of six would have attained the use of reason, and, therefore, he would need to be instructed before his re-baptism in the Catholic Church.

* * * *

IV. ADMISSION OF EX-COMMUNIST TO NOVICESHIP.

Dear Reverend Sir,

A young man—let us call him John—was born of mixed parents. He was baptised in the Catholic Church but was never reared in the Catholic faith. Nominally, at least, he was a member of the Church of England from infancy. As he grew up he fell away from the practice of religion altogether, became atheistic in outlook, and was a member of the Communist Party. In the course of his industrial and political activities he underwent one of those "conversions" with which we have become familiar. First, he resigned from the Communist Party; by many steps he came eventually to receive instruction in the Catholic faith, and now is a very ardent member of the Church. He proposes to seek admission to a religious congregation. Before encouraging this move, I am seeking your advice to know if he is debarred from entering.

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

(1) No doubt our correspondent is referring to the first of the provisions of Canon 542, in which are enumerated several factors which debar valid or licit admission to the religious novitiate. "The following cannot be validly admitted to the novitiate:—(i) Those who have joined a non-Catholic sect". The man in question, nominally at least, has been a member of the Church of England; also, in so far as he has been a member of the Communist Party, he must be classified as one who has been a member of an Atheistic sect. The Code Commission has given an official declaration that "Persons who belong or have belonged to an Atheistic sect are to be considered as to all legal effects, even those which concern sacred ordination and marriage, the same as persons who belong or have belonged to a non-Catholic sect". However, it appears that he is not debarred from entering a religious novitiate on these grounds, for the law of Canon 542 is to be understood as applicable to those who have been members of the Church and have fallen away and become members of a non-Catholic sect. It does not apply to those who have been converted from a non-Catholic sect to the Church.

This provision does not cover explicitly the case of those who, like the man in question, were baptised as infants in the Catholic Church and then brought up, through no fault of their own, outside the Church. However, there is authority as well as good reason for concluding that these also are not bound by the prohibition of Canon 542. There is a clear parity between them and those who, though baptised in heresy and brought up outside the Church, have been converted and become members of the Church.

JAMES CARROLL.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICES.

MANUALE PHILOSOPHIAE, by Ioannes Di Napoli. Rome. Marietti. 1950. Vols. I, II, 347 + 581 pp.

These first two volumes of a projected four volume text book embrace a General Introduction, Logic, Cosmology, Pyschology, Epistemology, and Ontology. The third volume will include Natural Theology, Ethics, and Aesthetics, and the fourth a short history of philosophy, a philosophical dictionary, and a sketch of modern philosophic trends. The programme is ambitious, and the volumes to hand show the treatment is a compressed one. However, the exposition is clear, and well presented; the elegant simple Latin should be a boon to seminary students; easy objections are given, to which they are to provide the answers. We suggest that this manual would be invaluable for the purpose of revising a course in philosophy: it would be difficult to find a better short exposition of modern Thomistic philosophy.

F.A.M.

* * * *

HIERARCHY CENTENARY CONGRESS, 1850-1950. London. Burns, Oates and Washbourne Ltd. pp. 64. English price, 7/6.

Last year the centenary of the restoration of the English Hierarchy was celebrated with an inspring Congress. It was noteworthy for the worldwide representation—seven Cardinals and members of the Hierarchy of a dozen countries, including our own; it gave special attention to the historical aspect, and was marked by notable sermons and talks; above all, the immense crowds at every function were living evidence of the progress of the Church in England in those hundred years. All these things are evidenced in this souvenir; half of it is devoted to beautifully reproduced photos, and much of the remainder consists of the addresses made during the week. So life-like is this record of those events that we almost expect to hear again Robert Spaight's wonderful tones bringing his commentary at Wembley to a climax with those memorable words of Newman, "the Church in England has died, and the Church lives again."

F.A.M.

Liturgy

RESPONSES AND ANOINTINGS IN BAPTISM OF ADULT—TONE OF VOICE AT SIDE ALTAR.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I should be obliged if you would answer the following questions in your valuable quarterly.

1) In the case of adult baptism
   a. Who makes the responses, the sponsor or the baptizandus?
   b. When an adult female is being baptised, must the anointing be carried as prescribed for infants?

2) Long ago, I recollect that the *A.C.R.* gave a reply as to the tone of voice of Celebrant at a side altar, while Mass is being celebrated on the main altar. I cannot lay my hands on that issue now. Could you please repeat that answer?

EUREKA.

REPLY.

1) The Roman Ritual (chap. iii, n. 6) directs that in the case of baptism of an adult, the catechumen himself replies to the interrogations of the priest, unless he is a deaf-mute, or speaks only a language unknown to the priest. In this last case, the catechumen answers the priest through the sponsor, if he understands the language, or through an interpreter, or by means of some sign.

The Order of Baptism of Adults (Rit. rom., c. iv) prescribes the same anointings of the adult catechumen as are prescribed for the baptism of infants. The rite provides for the necessary alterations in the formulae according as the catechumen is male or female, but there is no indication that in this latter case the anointings are to be omitted. Wapelhorst cites a Constitution of Pope Paul III, which declares that the anointing 'adultis mulieribus ponatur in illa parte, quam ratio pudicitiae demonstrabit' (*Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae,* ed. 5a, p. 409). One commentator, describing the anointings in infant baptism, says: 'unctio olei catechumenorum fieri debet in superiore parte pectoris et inter scapulas aut humeros' (*Ephemerides liturg.* 1944 (LVIII), p. 90). A fortiori this would apply in the case of baptism of a woman.

2) After enumerating the parts of the Mass which are to be said aloud in a private Mass, the General Rubrics of the Missal (chap. xvi, 1 & 2) add that the priest must take great care to pronounce the words

that are to be spoken aloud distinctly and becomingly. He should not read so fast, that he cannot attend to what he is reading; nor so punctiliously, that he becomes tedious to his hearers. The voice should not be so loud as to disturb others who may be celebrating in the church at the same time, nor so low that those present cannot hear.

* * * *

OBLIGATION TO WEAR BIRETTA.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is the wearing of a biretta, when proceeding to the Altar for the celebration of Holy Mass, prescribed *sub gravi?* What is to be said of a priest who habitually fails to wear a biretta on such occasions? Would you say that a priest going out to a country chapel, some miles from the Presbytery, would be bound to go provided with a biretta?

SIMPLEX.

REPLY.

There is no doubt that the rubrics require the Celebrant to wear a biretta when going to celebrate Mass (*Rit. servandus*, ii, 1). The IV Plenary Council also reminds priests of this obligation in *Decree* 355, (2). On the other hand it does not seem to be an obligation *sub gravi.* Is it even *sub levi?* Most moralists distinguish between preceptive and directive rubrics. The former bind in conscience, *sub gravi* or *sub levi* according to circumstances, and generally prescribe what must be observed *intra Missam.* Directive rubrics do not bind in conscience, and lay down what is to be done either before or after Mass. Logically, therefore, the majority of these authors maintain that the washing of the hands, the prayers to be said while vesting, and the '*Benedicite*' after Mass are not imposed under pain of sin. Some theologians, however, think that this distinction lacks a solid foundation, and they prefer to say that all rubrics bind in conscience, the gravity of the obligation being determined by the gravity of the matter and the common teaching of theologians. It is for the individual, then, to regulate his own conscience. Whatever may be said about the obligation in conscience, the correct procedure is evident and the conscientious priest will experience little difficulty in complying with the direction of the Missal.

* * * *

RESTORATION OF THE VIGIL OF EASTER.

The April issue of the *A.C.R.* (pp. 109-110) contains the Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the Restoring of the Vigil of

Easter to its primitive position. After recalling that the Vigil of Our Lord's Resurrection is, in the words of St. Augustine, 'the Mother of all sacred vigils', the Decree mentions how in the course of time the celebration of the rite was gradually anticipated to the morning, 'not without detriment to the original symbolism'. As a result of the historical research on the Liturgy carried out in recent years, and in order that the faithful would have better opportunity of assisting at the rites, numerous requests have been made to the Holy See for the restoration of the Vigil celebration to its primitive position and splendour. Consequently the Pope has approved the rubrics prepared by the Congregation of Rites for the night celebration of the Vigil of Easter, 'giving to the local Ordinaries the Faculty for this year to restore the night celebration of the Vigil as an experiment, and according to their prudent judgment'. Moreover, the local Ordinaries who use the faculty are to submit to the Congregation of Rites a report on 'the attendance and piety of the faithful and of the success of the restoration'.

The rubrics of the new rite clearly indicate that the Holy See has been induced to permit this experiment not simply for historical reasons, but more especially from a consideration of the pastoral value of the participation of the faithful in the Sacred Liturgy. So, for instance, the Blessing of the new Fire is to take place in a position at the entrance of the Church, 'where, namely, the people can best follow the sacred rite'. After the Deacon sings each 'Lumen Christi', the candles of the Celebrant, clergy, and people respectively are lighted from the Paschal Candle carried by the Deacon in place of the Triple Candle as previously. During the singing of the Lessons, the Celebrant, Ministers, clergy, and people sit and listen. Unless the Baptistery is a separate building from the Church and ancient custom demands that the blessing of the Baptismal Water be carried out in the Baptistery, the Decree directs that the blessing of the Baptismal Water should take place in the centre of the choir, 'in view of the faithful'. Then, following the blessing of the Water, there is the ceremony of the Renewal of Baptismal Promises by the whole congregation. These examples from the rubrics of the Decree are a manifestation of the desire of the Church, previously expressed by the Holy Father in the Encyclical on the Liturgy, 'that the faithful may take so active a part in the liturgy that it becomes really a sacred action in which both priest—especially the priest in his own parish—and people join in offering to Almighty God the worship that is His due' (English C.T.S. § 212).

THE DIVINE OFFICE.

If the night Vigil is observed in places where there is an obligation of reciting Office in choir, then Matins and Lauds are not anticipated on the Friday evening but are recited on Saturday morning, 'hora competenti'. The psalm *Miserere* is omitted after Lauds, as is also the case after each of the other Hours of the Office. The prayer *Respice* is replaced by the following prayer: 'Concede, quaesumus, omnipotens Deus: ut qui Filii tui resurrectionem devota expectatione praevenimus; eiusdem resurrectionis gloriam consequamur'. The Small Hours are unchanged, with the exception of the *Miserere* and the above prayer. Vespers are as on Holy Thursday excepting the 1st Antiphon, which is to be: 'Hodie afflictus sum valde, sed cras solvam vincula mea', and the antiphon to the Magnificat: 'Principes sacerdotum et pharisaei munierunt sepulcrum, signantes lapidem, cum custodibus'. The omission of the penitential Psalm 50 and its accompanying prayer is not surprising since they sound a slightly discordant note in the spirit of joyful expectancy of the day. Both seem to have been introduced little earlier than the 12th century.

THE BLESSING OF THE NEW FIRE.

The Decree directs that the Easter Vigil should commence at a time that will allow the solemn Mass to begin about midnight. In the early centuries the Vigil took place during the evening, beginning about sunset. A 9th century Pontifical of Poitiers states that care must be taken that the Gloria in excelsis is not intoned before the appearance of the first stars, so that the people may not leave the church before midnight. From the 12th century, however, the hour was gradually advanced and the whole ceremony was completed before midday. Before the ceremony all the lamps (luminaria) in the church are extinguished, to be lighted later on from the Paschal Candle. The rubric does not refer to lights used for the illumination of the church, but at the same time it would be fitting to reserve the full illumination of the church until later in the ceremony, when the candles of the faithful and the lamps are lighted. The fire is prepared in front of the door, in the porch, or within the church, 'ubi scilicet populus ritum sacrum melius sequi possit'.

Vested in alb, stole and violet cope, and accompanied by the ministers, the Celebrant proceeds to the blessing of the New Fire. After reciting the first prayer of blessing as found in the Missal, the Celebrant immediately sprinkles the fire with Holy Water. The thurifer takes the

charcoal from the fire, and places it in thurible. Incense is placed in the thurible by the Celebrant, who then incenses the New Fire.

Several changes will be noticed in this ceremony. The four prayers of blessing contained in the Missal did not originally refer to the fire or to the grains of incense, but to the lighting of the *lucerna,* which was to illuminate the ambo during the reading of the nocturnal lessons, so that the triple benediction now represents merely three alternative formulas (cfr. Schuster, *The Sacramentary,* vol. ii, p. 26). However, the first prayer has been retained as a blessing for the New Fire. The blessing of the grains of incense is omitted at this stage. Through a wrong interpretation of the Latin word *incensum,* the fourth prayer of the Missal came to be looked upon as a blessing of the grains of incense. *Incensum* is obviously derived from *incendere,* and in the prayer signifies the lighted candle rather than the grains of incense (*thus*). This same interpretation led to the practice of inserting the grains of incense in the Paschal Candle during the singing of the *Exsultet,* before the words: *'suscipe, Sancte Pater, incensi huius sacrificium vespertinum'.*

THE BLESSING OF THE PASCHAL CANDLE.

After the New Fire has been blessed, the acolyte brings the Paschal Candle and stands before the Celebrant, who, with a stylus, traces a cross between the holes made for the grains of incense, together with the letters Alpha and Omega, and the numbers of the current year. While doing this, he recites the following formula:

1) Christus heri et hodie (tracing the upright arm)
2) Principium et Finis (tracing the transverse arm)
3) Alpha (tracing *Alpha* above the upright arm)
4) et Omega (tracing *Omega* below the upright arm)
5) Ipsius sunt tempora (tracing 1 in top left hand angle of cross)
6) et saecula (tracing 9 in top right hand angle of cross)
7) Ipsi gloria et imperium (tracing 5 in lower left hand angle of cross)
8) per universa aeternitatis saecula. Amen. (tracing 1 in lower right hand angle of cross.)

The Deacon then presents the grains of incense to the Celebrant, who sprinkles them with Holy Water and incenses them three times, if they have not been previously blessed, and places them in the candle, in the

order indicated, while saying:

1) Per sua sancta vulnera
2) gloriosa
3) custodiat
4) et conservet nos
5) Christus Dominus. Amen.

1
4 2 5
3

The Celebrant receives from the Deacon a candle that has been lighted from the New Fire, and while lighting the Paschal Candle says:

Lumen Christi gloriose resurgentis
Dissipet tenebras cordis et mentis.

Immediately the Celebrant blesses the lighted Paschal Candle, using the prayer: *Veniat* found in the Missal for the blessing of the grains of incense.

The rite of marking the Paschal Candle with the cross and the greek symbols Alpha and Omega is a revival of an ancient custom which existed even earlier than the 7th century, and which was in use as late as the 18th century. A description of the rite similar to the one prescribed by the recent decree is contained in a roman Pontifical of the 12th century. The cross indicated the blessing and the greek letters signified that Christ, of Whom the Paschal Candle is a symbol, is King and Lord of ages. In some places it was customary to anoint the Candle with Chrism. As a result of the confusion that arose concerning the significance of the word *incensum* the custom of inserting the grains of incense in the Candle began, and became universal from the 12th century. The symbolism which the words of the new rite attribute to the grains of incense was commonly used in mediaeval and modern times. It is interesting to note also that the rubric now requires that the grains of incense be blessed only if they have not been previously blessed.

THE SOLEMN PROCESSION AND THE *EXSULTET*.

The Deacon, vested in white dalmatic, takes the Paschal Candle and the procession is formed. The thurifer and Subdeacon, carrying the Cross, precede the Deacon, and the Celebrant, clergy, and people follow in that order. At the entrance of the church the Deacon raises the Paschal Candle and sings: *Lumen Christi,* to which all reply, while genuflecting, *Deo gratias.* The Celebrant lights his own candle from the Paschal Candle. The *Lumen Christi* is repeated in the centre of the church, and after the response the candles of the clergy are lighted from the Paschal Candle. Following the third *Lumen Christi,* which is sung

in the centre of the choir, the candles of the people and the lamps in the church are lighted, again from the Paschal Candle. The Celebrant and clergy retire to their places in choir, and the Deacon places the Paschal Candle on its stand, in the centre of the choir, and, taking the book, goes to receive the blessing before singing the *Exsultet*. After placing the book on the stand and incensing it, the Deacon walks around the Paschal Candle and, having completed the circle, incenses it. All stand for the singing of the *Exsultet,* which is the same as in the Missal with the exception of the concluding prayer for the Emperor, in place of which is substituted a formula applicable to the civil government.

The rubrics of the new decree restore the Paschal Candle to its position of honour. It is the image of Christ triumphant over death, the darkness is dispelled by the light of the candles lighted from it. In the course of time the Paschal Candle had become so large and ornate that it could no longer be carried in the procession and was replaced by the triple candle, but, as is plain, much of the significance of the Paschal Candle was thereby lost. The order of the procession has been altered slightly, but the order given in the Decree is more practical since the rubrics of the Decree direct all to genuflect towards the Paschal Candle at the *Lumen Christi.*

THE LESSONS.

Following the singing of the *Exsultet* the Lessons are read. Their number has been reduced to four; the first, fourth, eighth, and eleventh as found in the Missal. The chants and prayers which accompany these lessons in the Missal are also retained. The rubric of the Decree instructs the Celebrant, ministers, clergy, and people to remain seated and listen while the lessons are being read. The last direction is a recognition of the dramatic character of the liturgical functions, in which Celebrant, ministers, choir, and people have their own proper part to perform. The practice of the Celebrant reading *submissa voce* those parts which are sung by the ministers or by the choir was unknown before the end of the 13th century. Durandus (+ 1296) first tells us that in the Papal Mass the Pope's Chaplains read the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei. The evolution continued during the two succeeding centuries until the Missal of Pius V, published in 1570, prescribed the recitation of the various parts as we know it to-day.

THE LITANIES AND BLESSING OF THE BAPTISMAL WATER.

When the lessons are finished, the first part of the Litany of the

Saints, as far as *Propitius esto,* is sung by two chanters. All kneel and answer. The invocations are not doubled. A vessel containing the water to be blessed is prepared in the centre of the choir, in front of th Paschal Candle, 'in conspectu fidelium'. The Tract *Sicut cervus,* formerly sung in the procession to the font, is omitted, but for the rest the blessing is imparted as in the Missal. In places, however, where the baptistery is a separate building from the church and where ancient custom demands it, e.g., at the Lateran Basilica, the rite of the Missal is to be followed and the first part of the Litany is to be sung after the clergy return to the church. The pastoral considerations of these rites has been already remarked upon.

THE RENEWAL OF THE BAPTISMAL PROMISES.

After the blessing of the Baptismal Water, or, if this does not take place, after the first part of the Litany of the Saints, the Celebrant incenses the Paschal Candle and then proceeds to the ambo or pulpit for the renewal of the baptismal promises. This is the only entirely new element introduced by the Decree. The formula of this rite may be recited in the vernacular in those places for which the partial use of the vernacular has been approved for the administration of Baptism. It could be translated thus:

On this most sacred night, dearly beloved brethren, our holy Mother the Church, contemplating the death and burial of our Lord Jesus Christ, keeps vigil in gratitude for His love; and looking forward to His glorious Resurrection she rejoices with exceeding gladness.

Since, as the Apostle teaches, we are buried together with Christ by baptism unto death; so, as Christ is risen from the dead, we also should walk in the newness of life. We know that our old man is crucified together with Christ in order that we may be slaves of sin no longer. Let us consider, then, that we are dead to sin but alive unto God, in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Wherefore, dearly beloved, at the conclusion of the exercises of Lent, let us renew the promises of our holy Baptism, by which we long ago renounced Satan and his pomps and the world, the enemy of God, and promised to serve God faithfully in the Catholic Church.

Therefore:

Priest: Do you renounce Satan?
People: We do renounce him.
Priest: And all his works?
People: We do renounce them.

Priest: And all his pomps?
People: We do renounce them.
Priest: Do you believe in God, the Father almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth?
People: We do believe.
Priest: Do you believe in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, Who was born and who suffered for us?
People: We do believe.
Priest: Do you believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and life everlasting?
People: We do believe.
Priest: Let us now beseech God together, as our Lord Jesus Christ taught us to pray:
People: Our Father ...
Priest: May the almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Who begot us again of water and of the Holy Ghost, and Who granted us pardon of our sins, keep us by his grace in the same Jesus Christ, unto life everlasting.
People: Amen.

The second part of the Litany of the Saints is recited as before. Meantime the Celebrant and ministers retire to the sacristy to vest for Mass and the altar is prepared.

THE VIGIL MASS.

The Mass is as in the Missal, with few changes. The prayers at the foot of the altar are omitted, and the Celebrant incenses the altar upon his arrival. The Decree adopts the former antiphon of the Magnificat as the Communion verse, and the prayer: *Spiritum nobis* as the Postcommunion. The Last Gospel is not read.

Such are the main features of the rite for the restoration of the Easter Vigil. It has been permitted this year as an experiment, and time will tell whether the Holy See will renew this permission.

P. L. MURPHY.

Homiletics

BLESSED OLIVER PLUNKET.

On July 11th, 1681, Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland, was executed for treason on Tyburn Hill in London. He was declared a martyr for the Faith and raised to the honours of the Altar during the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII. His is the brightest name in the annals of the Irish Church during the whole era of persecution. That Ireland kept the Faith during the Penal Days is due, under God, more to Oliver Plunket than to any other man.

The scion of a noble family, Oliver Plunket studied for the priesthood at the Irish College in Rome, which had been founded to provide intrepid missionaries to brave the terrors of Cromwell's persecution in Ireland. Ordained priest after a brilliant course of studies, he was for some years active in Rome as a professor, a post he occupied with distinction both for learning and piety. Fifteen years later he was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, and entered upon his apostolic labours in Ireland. That was then truly "a most distressful country".

Under Cromwell most Catholics had been driven from their estates or farms and existed in extreme poverty. Many of faint heart had gone over to the Protestant religion; almost all the bishops had been expelled from the country, and the priests remaining were tragically few. Schools, monasteries and churches had been razed to the ground or given over to profane use. It looked very much as if the true Faith would soon be extinguished in the "Isle of saints and scholars".

To the enfeebled and disheartened Catholics of Ireland the coming of Archbishop Plunket was like a new Pentecost. Fired with truly apostolic zeal and possessed of indefatigable energy he tramped from end to end of the island rallying the faithful and inspiring them with new courage, steadying the wavering and winning back the deserters. The clergy he reorganized and reformed, revitalizing the veterans and recruiting new members to their ranks. His cathedral the wind-swept hillside, he administered the sacraments to multitudes long without them, confirming no less than fifty thousand persons in the first four years. He re-established schools, having obtained that begrudged concession from the government, and even the Protestant gentry began sending their sons to his high school at Drogheda.

But the powers of darkness were not to surrender without a last

furious counter-attack. The chief lieutenant of Satan in this new onslaught was one, Titus Oates.

This son of an Anglican parson, although expelled from two schools and ejected from Cambridge University, was himself ordained a minister; but he soon lost his parish, having been twice indicted for perjury and having acquired a reputation for dishonesty. He succeeded in escaping from Newbury prison and shipped aboard a warship as chaplain. The Navy in those days was the last refuge of the cut-throat and the scoundrel, but after a year's experience of Titus Oates as a chaplain, the Admiralty had had enough and his services were dispensed with. Shortly afterwards this versatile rogue scraped acquaintance with the Duke of Norfolk, who was secretly a Catholic. His pretended conversion to the Faith soon followed and he so hoodwinked his new friends that he was sent abroad to Spain to study for the priesthood. His superiors packed him home in disgrace after three months, but such was his plausibility that the Jesuits were persuaded to give him a new trial in their seminary in Flanders, but they despaired of him and once again he was ignominiously ejected. On his return to London, he concocted the lunatic story of the "Popish Plot". With the help of a confederate in the palace, he was able to bring his invention under the notice of Charles II. The easy-going and dissolute "Merry Monarch" was sceptical of the whole business but nevertheless passed on to his ministers Oates' memorial entitled "True and exact Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party against the life of His Sacred Majesty, the Government and the Protestant Religion". In this clumsy, ill-written and puerile libel, the chief item tells of the design to assassinate the King. A Benedictine and a Jesuit, it appears, had been told off to shoot the king with "carabines and silver bullets" in consideration of £1500 and 30,000 Masses to be said for their souls. To make more certain, the king was to be poisoned by the Queen's physician at a cost of £15,000, and stabbed by two monks (free of charge). If this did not settle him, he was to be set upon at Windsor by four Irish ruffians who were to have £1 down and £80 on completion of the job. The heads of the government were also to be murdered, and a general massacre of Protestants was to follow. England was then to be invaded by the French, assisted by an army already raised in Ireland by Oliver Plunket.

A more malicious and unfounded calumny was never hatched by disordered brains. Needless to say, neither then nor since has there

ever been discovered the slightest evidence to support the monstrous accusation. Under normal circumstances, so flimsy and ridiculous a fabrication would be laughed out of court, but for political purposes it was taken up by the Whig party, and the then leader, Lord Shaftesbury, so identified himself with it that it was popularly known as the "Shaftesbury Plot". This unscrupulous politician succeeded in stampeding Parliament into reprisals. Panic spread to the public and London went mad with fear and hatred. The penal laws, which had begun to be somewhat relaxed, were once more put into cruel activity. The capital was proclaimed in a state of siege. The troops stood to arms, the streets were barricaded, patrols marched up and down the highways, cannon were planted around the royal palace, and no citizen thought himself safe without a club with which to brain the Popish assassins.

A score of prominent Catholics were executed and the gaols were filled with others of less account.

In Ireland, Archbishop Plunket eluded capture for many months, but was at length apprehended and brought to England. After six months' close confinement in Newgate prison, during which time he was refused legal advice and any knowledge of the charges against him, he was brought to trial. The trial was a travesty of justice. No secret was made of the fact that his real crime was that of being a Catholic priest. The judge presiding (Chief Justice Pemberton) stated from the Bench that there could be no greater crime than to endeavour to propagate the Catholic faith. Sentence of death was pronounced as a matter of course, to which the condemned replied with a joyful "Thanks be to God". Vast crowds assembled at the place of execution and many were visibly affected by his heroism and the joy he manifested in dying for the Faith. Even the most rabid hater of Papists could scarce remain dry-eyed as he preached his last sermon from the scaffold. Then, after the barbarous practice of the day, he was hanged, cut down before he was dead, disembowelled, and hacked into quarters.

Blessed Oliver did not die in vain: an instant revulsion of public feeling followed. Lord Shaftesbury was cast into the Tower; Titus Oates was fined £100,000, whipped, pilloried and imprisoned. Judge Jeffries said of him: "He has deserved more punishment than the laws of the land can inflict". Never since has anyone been executed in England for the crime of being a Catholic. Gradually the severity of the penal laws was mitigated, but, a hundred and fifty years had yet to pass before their complete abolition.

W. H. BAKER.

Notes

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF *RERUM NOVARUM.*

It is hardly an exaggeration to venture the opinion that society, as we have known it in Australia, is in danger of disintegrating. There are some elements which are openly defying the rule of law. Others which recognize no law, but their own sectional interest. They will tolerate no law but that which benefits them. Governments are weak, and will not exercise their authority on lawless elements. Law and order can no longer be taken for granted. In the face of this, sound economic and political policies are necessary. Moral principles should be given full play. But above all an endeavour should be made to foster throughout society a strong spiritual and moral idealism. An idealism that will act as a renewing force within the weakened body politic, to revive and restore it. This underlines the importance of Catholic Social teaching and makes relevant a word of appreciation of the well-spring of Catholic Social teaching and inspiration, *Rerum Novarum,* whose sixtieth anniversary is celebrated this year.

Rerum Novarum was given to the world in 1891—at the end of a century that brought many changes to the world. It was the century of Liberal Democracy which went gaily on its way overturning thrones and altars and establishing the new order of political democracy and secularism. In the opening words of *Rerum Novarum,* "that the spirit of revolutionary change...should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics is not surprising." And the economic and social problem resulting was no trifling one. To quote the same source, "a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself". Liberal Democracy had tended to ignore this problem. It thus left open the field to the Socialists, who went to the masses with the gospel of economic democracy. "The Socialists working on the poor man's envy of the rich are trying to do away with private property". The world was evidently on the threshold of a new age. The age-old dynasties had gone, the day of industrialism and political democracy had come.

To meet this crisis the leadership of the Church required a man of vision and courage. Such vision as could embrace the whole world and

see far into the future. And such courage as would dauntlessly both forsake the outmoded for the new, and attack error and injustice wherever it appeared. Providence gave the Church just these traits in Pope Leo XIII. To these gifts he added great spiritual resources, a realistic grip of the new social forces and a genuine human sympathy for the poor and the weak.

In engaging the social problem, Leo was able to call upon nearly a century of Catholic social teaching and action. The weak and oppressed had been defended in word and action by such names as Ozanam, Lacordaire and de Mun in France; by von Ketteler, "my illustrious predecessor", as Leo called him, in Germany; by Descurtins and Cardinal Mermillod in Switzerland; and by Vogelsang in Austria. When this wealth of experience felt the impress of Leo's dominant personality, the Church was the richer for *Rerum Novarum.*

Quite frankly and without pretension the Encyclical takes up the cause of the poor. It is for the working classes "we are pleading", it says. But just as fearlessly it charges both the old thing, Capitalism, and the new thing, Socialism, with excesses to the detriment of the worker. The worker enjoys personal dignity and is entitled to respect and justice. Against the Socialist, he has a right to property, and against the Capitalist the right to a just wage and trade union. The State is reminded of its duty to the commonwealth and personal welfare. No quarter is given to either the over-intrusive state of the Socialists, or the far too-retiring state of the Liberal Democrats. Amongst the more important positive proposals were widely-diffused property, strict justice in the remuneration of the worker, the formation of associations of workers and employers respectively, with a view to their free co-operation on all labour problems.

In 1891 Australia was relatively undeveloped compared with today. At first sight, one is tempted to dismiss the possibility in its regard of the pertinence of *Rerum Novarum.* In actual fact, although Australia was still a predominantly pastoral country, she had just emerged from a period of very bitter industrial strife. The big unions—the shearers, coal-miners, and wharf labourers—had banded together for direct action, but with futile results. And while some were proclaiming the Socialist creed, the future Australian Labour Party was sending its first representatives to the New South Wales Parliament. These happenings had not escaped Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney. He had already distinguished himself in the cause of justice and proved himself worthy of the tradition of the Catholic Social Movement. It is

not surprising then to learn that when *Rerum Novarum,* despite the slower communications of those times, was in Sydney in a matter of weeks, it was the subject of a lengthy public lecture by the Cardinal in a matter of days. (In the widely-representative audience was Edmund Barton, future first Prime Minister of Australia, who referred to the encyclical as that "great document".)

The warm reception given to *Rerum Novarum* by Australia's leading churchman is pleasant to recall. It meant that Australian soil was already prepared for the seeds of Christian Democracy and Social Justice, that were now being strewn by the Supreme Sower. But the Cardinal's enthusiasm for the encyclical was by no means shared by the Sydney Trades and Labour Council. A motion of appreciation for the Cardinal's lecture, it quite rudely rejected. This only indicated that the very ills Leo had set out to counter were already abroad in Australia, and emphasised not merely the relevance but the necessity of such a document as *Rerum Novarum.*

To gauge the immediate effects of the encyclical in Australia is not easy. But it seems fair to say that at least it gave root to the idea of Christian Democracy in Australia. R. D. Meagher, a contemporary of the Cardinal's, in later years could claim as president of the State A.L.P. conference of N.S.W., that in contra-distinction to the Socialists, he was a Christian Democrat. James Scullin, a former Prime Minister, frankly testifies to *Rerum Novarum* as for him a most important source of moral idealism, during the early days of this century. On the other hand, in the matter of Socialism and Capitalism it was no more successful in Australia than it was elsewhere in the world. As Capitalism became monopoly Capitalism, pastoral Capitalism in Australia became industrial Capitalism. And as Socialism broke into two streams giving off the more violent revolutionary Communism, the Australian Labour Party in 1921 embraced the complete Socialization objective of Socialism, and saw formed from its ranks the Australian Communist Party. Thus when *Quadragesimo Anno* was issued to adapt its predecessor's principles to a more distracted world, what it said of the general scene, could be said almost equally of Australia.

To-day, twenty years after *Quadragesimo Anno,* when we would like this commemorative note to be only a thing of joy, it would be no service to truth to pretend that the evils of society in Australia have not intensified. Communism, the result of the Socialism condemned by Leo, has fastened itself with almost irrepressible tenacity upon the Australian social body. Capitalism seems blind to the necessity for con-

structive, creative action. Certain elements in the A.L.P. are so attached to Statism or Caesarism, that they seem to be making its ranks impossible for those who genuinely voice the principles of Christian Democracy. But however much these trends tip the scales adversely, we must not lose sight of the fact that there is to-day an increasingly conscious appreciation of the content of and need for the social encyclicals; and that Christian Democracy as an ideal and a faith is being voiced both inside and outside political parties. Men and women are carrying on the work consecrated sixty years ago in *Rerum Novarum.* They take comfort in the thought that for authentic commission and noble origin their work lacks nothing. The presence of this encouraging influence in Australian Catholic life is our best tribute to the memory of a great pontiff and his history-making encyclical.

PATRICK FORD.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICES.

THIRTY-THREE FRIDAYS, by Father Aloysius, O.F.M. Cap., Dublin. M. H. Gill and Son, pgs. 188, pr. 7/6.

This is made up of thirty-three mediations on Our Lord's passion, beginning at the last supper and ending with the Holy Ghost's descent. In form they are all similar. There is a short account of a particular incident, drawn mainly from the gospels, but with slight additions from well-known "Lives" of Christ. A practical consideration of it follows.

As the sub-title shows, they are intended for priests, but many of the clergy will find them too elementary. However, they should be of use among the laity, for the considerations are simple and good, while there is very little which applies only to the priest.

The passion is always of great interest and the virtue of this little book is that it gives the scene in detail before seeking lessons. The word pictures lack life, they are not imaginative, yet to read them is to cover again the story of Christ's death. B.J.

* * * *

UN SEUL CHEF, by H. Bouessé, O.P. Gabalda, Paris, 1950.

In France, during the closing years of the war, there was a particularly widespread desire for a strong national leader. This small book, which bears the subtitle, *'Jésus Christ, Chef de l'Univers et Tête des Saints',* is an attempt to make use of this current fact in order to illumine supernatural truth. Père Bouëssé sets out to attract his readers to a greater love and service of Our Lord by showing them how the Son of God alone can fulfil that desire they have of submitting themselves to the direction of one they can trust fully. Their wish to gain strength and freedom through union with a leader of the first rank finds full meaning only through the doctrines of the Incarnation and Redemption.

The book is very suited for meditative reading, being orderly in construction and packed tight with good thoughts. It could also provide a very suitable basis for a series of conferences, having been originally intended for some such purpose. A further valuable feature is a long appendix in the form of a series of notes and extensive quotations from the Fathers and theologians; these provide readings to illustrating various ideas connected with the main theme of the book.

W.S.

Book Reviews

THE MESSAGE OF FATIMA, by C. C. Martindale, S.J. Burns Oates, London, 1950. Pp. 183, price, 10/6.

In telling yet again the story of Our Lady's apparitions at Fatima and the messages delivered to the world on those occasions the well-known English Jesuit has given us one of the best works to have appeared on the subject in the English language. He had approached his task with certain doubts and misgivings. He had perceived certain conflicting evidence in the accounts of the privileged seers. Like not a few of our generation, he was not altogether happy on the subject of Fatima. So he went in person to the scene of the remarkable events and applied all the forces of a critical brain to the first-hand evidence that awaited him in abundance.

For two years the author worked on that evidence, plodding along in the cool mental-temperature that was so necessary for an objective verdict. But the caution and meticulous care that characterize his sifting of the evidence, still leave room for many beautiful, graphic descriptions that flow so easily from his warm pen. So intimately does he express the thoughts and feelings of the surviving witnesses of the great events of 1917, that he leaves one with the impression that those souls, whom he set out to read with such a discerning eye, actually drew him to themselves and filled his soul with their own convictions.

The description of the great miracle of 13th October is given with a calm and dignity as by one who narrates an important episode from the records of history, the facts of which allow only one conclusion to the honest mind. Father Martindale then joyfully salutes the Queen of Heaven "under this, the latest of her many titles,—Our Lady of the Rosary of Fatima".

The author's insight into the mystic transformation of the souls of Jacinta and Francisco is, we think, one of the most valuable assets of this refreshing book, and one of the best contributions yet made to the revelation of the inner-life of the Fatima story. His use of psychology in elucidating several not-so-clear parts of the children's accounts is really fine, and should open up a new approach to certain difficulties in the narration of the heavenly message. Fr. Martindale admits that there still exist some obscurities and conflicting shades of detail. But what else may one expect when Heaven meets earth, with such dazzling brilliance, in the minds of little children?

T.M.

THE IRISH THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Edited by Professors of the Faculty of Theology, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, vol. XVIII, No. 1, January, 1951. Pp. 97.

After a lapse of nearly thirty years, this important quarterly has been revived. No doubt, the number of theological reviews is very large, but the English language, at least, is poor in such Catholic scientific journals. Hence, a wide measure of support should be forthcoming to what promises to be a potent force in 'the elucidation and defence of Catholic truth', to quote the foreword of the first number. In this issue Mgr. Kissane contributes an article on the interpretation of psalm 108 (109); Dr. Corcoran writes the first of two articles on St. Thomas Aquinas and Sir Edmund Whittaker; Dr. Moran is represented by a note on a Protestant objection concerning the Mass; while Dr. McCarthy, likewise in a note, writes under the heading: 'Towards a Definition of Impotence'. In all there are five articles, three Notes, some fine book reviews, and the Latin text of the Encyclical *Humani Generis* in the Documents section. It is to be hoped that a wide net is cast in the Book Reviews section. If one may venture a suggestion a survey of recent theological and scriptural works at periods would be of interest and value. It is to be hoped, further, that an occasional synthetic article will stimulate readers, without detracting from the scientific aim of *The Irish Theological Quarterly*. The Editors hope that a sufficient number of subscribers 'at home and abroad' will give a fair trial to the journal. The annual subscription is £1stg., which should be sent to the Rev. Treasurer, *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland. *The Irish Theological Quarterly* is a recent exchange with the *A.C.R.*

T.V.

* * * *

General Index

Contents of Volume XXVIII.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS (Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)
Adelaide and Port Augusta, Change in diocesan boundaries 193
Bishop's consecration without canonical provision, Decree about 192
Brisbane and Toowoomba, Change in diocesan boundaries 193
Byzantine Rite, Decree of Holy Office on 191
Easter, Vigil of, restored to primitive position 109
Eucharistic Fast, Faculty about . 95

Jubilee extended to world 97
Jubilee Year, Instruction of S.A. Penitentiary about 105
Munificentissimus Deus, Apostolic Constitution 1
Rotary Club, Decree of Holy Office about 191
Sponsa Christi, Apostolic Constitution 283
Sydney and Bathurst, Change in diocesan boundaries 192

ARTICLES.

Bishop Willson, VI, VII, VIII, IX (Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. H. Cullen, V.G.) 31, 111, 203, 313
Definition of the Assumption, The (Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.) 16
God and His Grace (Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.) 195
Plea for the Alcoholic, A. (Rev. R. J. Murphy, S.J.) 23
Private Revelation and a Recent Book (Rev. M. F. Toal, D.D.) 294

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.
(Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D.)

The Theology of the Mass, II, III, IV, V 44, 120, 212, 323

MORAL THEOLOGY.
(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D.)

"Divorced" Persons, Sins of 230
Knitting on Sundays (Rt. Rev. J. Carroll, D.C.L.) 58
Mass, Application of (Rt. Rev. J. Carroll, D.C.L.) 61
Mass, Place for hearing Sunday, 134, 348
Nurses, Some problems of 340
Reserved Cases, Absolution from 224
Sterility Tests 137

CANON LAW.
(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L.)

Baptism administered privately by nurse 148
Burial, Ecclesiastical, of careless Catholic 67
Chapels, Community, in New Settlers' Camps 237
Children baptized in heresy and their reception into the Church 353
Eucharistic Fast, Renewal of faculty to dispense 238
Marriage, Mixed, and third guarantee for dispensation 351
Marriage, Validity of bigamists's 62
Mass, Sunday, in convent chapel 352
Mixed Religion, Dispensation from 235
New Settlers and National chaplains 232
Noviceship, Admission of ex-Communist to 355
Religious Service, Combined 65
Trading forbidden to clerics and religious 142, 235

LITURGY.
(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)

Altar, Side, Titular of 151
Assumption of B.V.M., Text of new Mass 154
Baptism of adult, Responses and anointings at 357
Biretta, Obligation to wear 358
Breviary, Some suggested reforms of 244
Christ the King and the Heroic Act, Conditions for gaining indulgence in prayer to 72
Church and its furnishings, Notes on, VI. (Rev. R. F. Donohoe) 69
Cross, Processional, Manner of Carrying at Stations 151
Easter, Vigil of, Restoration of . 358
Eucharist, Reservation of, without weekly Mass 152
Litany of Loreto, New invocation in 154
Mass, Funeral, without corpse .. 153
Mass, Hall for, Blessing of 152
Oratio super populum 243
Order, Sacrament of, Alterations in Roman Pontifical about 153
Paschal Candle, Renewal of 151
Tabernacle Veil, Colour of, at Requiem 71
Veil, Changing of, after ablutions 71, 241
Voice at side-altar, Tone of 357

HOMILETICS
(Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D.)

Blessed Oliver Plunket 366
Fruits of Holy Communion, The 157
Lent 75
Presence of God, The 248

NOTES.

Burchard's *Liber Notarum* (V. Rev. Mgr. T. Veech) ... 250
Cinema is the highest form of art, The (Rev. J. Burnheim) 78
Diamond Jubilee of *Rerum Novarum* (Rev. P. P. Ford, B.A.) ... 369
Heinrich Pesch, S.J. (1854-1926) (Rev. N. Timbs, B.Ec.) 259
Max Jacob (V. Rev. Mgr. T. Veech) ... 83
New light on the death of Erasmus (V. Rev. Mgr. T. Veech) ... 160
Youth and Youth Movements (Rev. C. J. Duffy, D.D., Ph.D.) 79

BOOK REVIEWS.

Arnobius (Trans. McCracken) . 179
Book of Psalms, The (Trans. Cath. Biblical Assn. of America) 265
Catherine McAuley (Savage) ... 176
Catholic University of America, 1903-1909: *The Rectorship of D. J. O'Connell* (Barry) .. 269
Changing the Constitution (Edit. Bland) 87
Church in the Christian Empire, The, Vol. 1 (Palanque-Bardy-de Labriolle) 266
De Censuris (Cappello) 165
De Gratia Christi (Daffara) 171
De La Salle (Battersby) 168
Didache, The (trans. Kleist) ... 177
Early Christian Baptism and the Creed (Crehan) 264
Easy does it (Reilly) 173
Epistemology (Van Steenberghen) 166
Faith of the Catholic Church, The (Martindale) 23
First Catholic Mission to the Australian Aborigines, The (Thorpe) 88
Foundations of Philosophy, The (Fleming) 277
Glorious Assumption of the Mother of God, The (Duhr) . 263
Going God's Way (Beattie) 163
Gospel Story, The, Vol. 1 (Cox) 182
Greatness of the soul and the Teacher (St. Augustine, Ed. Quasten-Plumpe) 268
Hierarchy Centenary Congress 1850-1950 356
In the furrow of the Cross (M. Maria) 119
Irish Theological Quarterly, The 374
Life of St. Antony (St. Athanasius, Ed. Quasten-Plumpe) 269
Lisheen (Sheehan) 211
Livres des Maccabees (Abel) ... 164
Love is a light burden (Mother M. Oliver) 92
Manuale Philosophiae, Vols. I, II (Di Napoli) 356
Mary Book, The (Edit. Sheed) . 169
Mental Prayer and Modern Life (Tr. Lehner) 280
Message of Fatima, The (Martindale) 373
Mission to the Poorest (Loew) 279
Moments of Life (Zeller) 93
Month, The 150
Mother Patrick of Paris (Maire) 180
Mystery of Faith, The, Vol. II (trans. Carroll) 90
Neuroses and Sacraments (Keenan) 274
Newman's Idea of a University: Idea and Reality (McGrath) . 271
On Prayer (Caussade) 187
Philosophy of Form, A. (Watkin) 278
Praelectiones Biblicae, Propaedeutica Biblica (Simon-Prado) 266
Priest in the Modern World, The (Suhard) 202
Saints are not sad (Ed. Sheed) . 183
Seek ye first (Griffin) 77
S. Thom. Aquin. in Arist. libros de sensu et sensato; De Memoria et reminiscentia comment. (Ed. Spiazzi) 186
St. Thom. Aquin. X libros ethicorum Arist. ad Nicomachum expositio (Ed. Spiazzi) 186
Studies in Australian Social Problems 74
Thirty-Three Fridays (Fr. Aloysius) 372
This Perverse Generation (Michaels) 194
Treasury of Russian Spirituality (Ed. Fedotov) 273
Two in One Flesh (Messenger) 185
Unknown God, The (Noyes) ... 181
Un Seul Chef (Bouessé) 372
Vessels of Clay (Trese) 276
Who are the Sisters of Mercy? (Goodman) 279